LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH
R. P. D.

THE BEVERIDGE REPORT
William Gallacher, M.P.

THE STRUGGLE OF OCCUPIED EUROPE
Quæstor

THE FRENCH PEOPLE WILL CHOOSE
Jean Baudre

LABOUR PROSPECT IN 1943
George Allison

OUTLOOK FOR 1943
R. G. Gosling

A MINER LOOKS AT 1943
Abe Moffat

ANTI-SOVIET FILTH
D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P.

BOOK REVIEWS

WAR OUTLOOK FOR 1943

6D

JANUARY 1943

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXV. No. 1

CONTENTS

January, 1943

	Page
Notes of the Month—*War Outlook for* 1943 by R. P. D.	1
The Beveridge Report by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.	7
The Struggle of Occupied Europe by QUAESTOR	11
The French People Will Choose by JEAN BAUDRE	17
Labour Prospect in 1943 by GEORGE ALLISON	19
Outlook for 1943 by R. G. GOSLING	22
A Miner Looks at 1943 by ABE MOFFAT	24
Anti-Soviet Filth by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.	26
Book Reviews by IVOR MONTAGU and P. G. BARSTOW, M.P.	31

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Total Received in December, 1942 : £92 : 9 : 11

Up to the time of going to Press (which we put off from December 14 to December 16) only three entries for the Challenge issued by the Seven Red Artillerymen have been received. The Artillerymen themselves (now swollen in numbers to fifteen, the recruits being Shervan, Lamb, Gilder, Clarke, Jefferson, Edwards, Barnes and S.M.T.) retain the lead with donations totalling £2 4s. and a list of eight new readers. Next comes "A Group of Salisbury Readers" with a higher donation (£3) but with no list of new readers; further, there is no indication how many of them are civilians and thus with more money to spend. The third group is perhaps the most interesting of all, the Group of Convalescent Ex-Servicemen, who during the past several months have been amongst our most regular supporters.

With increasing calls on our space we shall not always be able to list donations in full. But we are specially glad to welcome a Group of Professional Workers working on munitions of war, who kick off with 35s. But the total is not so good as we hoped. It makes the total collected for the year only £901 2s. 6d. as compared with last year's £903 16s. 4d. We missed beating our own record by a very small margin!

Targets seem to be the fashion nowadays (someone even said the other day: "Shall we achieve our cheese target this week?") so we propose to set a monthly target for the Fund, beginning with the January Fund, which will be £100. This is a modest figure and we do not think we are guilty of wish-fulfilment in aiming at this, although it is somewhat higher than figures recently reached. Please help us to attain it!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

War Outlook for 1943—Twelve Months' Record—Turning Point of 1942—Gains and Losses—Perspective of 1943—Anticipations of Victory—Prophecies of Prolonged War—Lack of United Strategic Plan—Opposing Strategies—Enemies of Speedy Victory—Peoples' Interest in Speedy Victory—Political Strategy and Darlanism—India—Anti-Semitism—Fifth Column—Drawing the Balance—For Victory in 1943

WITH 1943 we are entering a year whose decisions and actions will govern a whole future epoch. The favourable turn in the situation since the autumn of 1942, the growing strength of the United Nations and the beginning of the offensive of the United Nations should spur us on to renewed efforts and determination to ensure that 1943 shall be the year of the final defeat of Hitler and of the victory of the peoples over Fascism. Is this goal attainable in 1943? Or must we accept the alternative perspective, widely put forward in official quarters, which sees 1943 as one more link in an extending chain of many years of prolonged warfare still before us as the only road to final victory? On the answer we make to this question much depends. For what is here involved is not merely a question of the time factor, with all that that means of hope or hardship for hundreds of millions of people. It is not a question of idle, unprofitable speculation, peering into the future or wishful thinking, in face of the vast uncertainties, the chances and changes of a still evenly balanced world war. What is here involved are vital questions of politics and strategy, of the plan of the United Nations for victory, which must occupy the forefront of our attention at the opening of 1943. For it is our decisions and actions at the opening of 1943 which will in fact govern the perspective.

WHAT is the outlook for 1943? At the beginning of 1942, in the January issue of this journal twelve months ago, we spoke of 1942 as "the decisive year" of the world conflict: first, in the sense that the maximum thrust of the Axis offensive would be delivered in 1942, and that the outcome of this battle would determine the final outcome of the war ("the full thrust of Axis Fascism for world domination is now exerting its maximum strength in all regions. . . .The prophets of passivity and 'wait till 1943' have been overtaken by the speed of events; 1942 already opens the year of great decisions"); and second, in the sense that the possibility and task opened out before the anti-Fascist alliance, if its full strength were exerted in a combined offensive, by the establishment of the Second Front in Europe, to make this decisive year also the year of final victory over Hitler.

IN the record of experience 1942 proved the decisive year in the first sense. But not in the second. The offensive of Hitler's armies on the Eastern Front in the summer and autumn of 1942, reaching to the Volga and the Caucasus, with two hundred and forty divisions, represented the supreme thrust of the Axis and the highest moment of danger for the United Nations. The successful Soviet resistance to this offensive and the holding of Stalingrad did in fact prove the decisive turning-point of the war. From that point the tide of the war has turned. The peak of Axis man-power for the offensive has been passed, after the crippling losses inflicted by the Soviet armies, with eight millions put out of action. It is possible, though less certain, that the peak of Axis war production has been passed. The offensive of the United Nations has begun, even if at present only on an initial and limited scale. The advantages of man-power and of war production are now decisively on the side of the United Nations. The Axis Powers, as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the speeches of the Nazi leaders have begun to indicate, are thrown in the main on to the defensive (which does not exclude new and violent offensive actions in particular regions). The first scampering of the rats to the future winning side makes itself felt, and raises new political issues. The face of the war has indeed changed as a result of the battles of 1942.

THAT is one side of the outcome of 1942. But it is necessary to face no less firmly and clearly the other side. The absence of the Second Front in Europe prevented 1942 from being the year of victory over Hitler, and lost the full utilisation of the opportunity which the defence of Stalingrad offered. For ten months of the year the Soviet armies had still to continue to face alone the full strength of the Nazi armies and their satellites. The Anglo-American offensive was only opened in the last two months of the year, and then only on a limited scale, with a limited proportion of the Anglo-American forces, against a very small proportion of the Nazi forces and in an outlying region which can only be preliminary to the main battlefield. The initial successes won in Africa have been welcome and important for the possibilities they hold out; the accompanying Soviet winter offensive has further weakened the Nazi forces; but it would only be harmful to exaggerate the extent of the offensive of the United Nations now begun, the extent of combination of strategy achieved, or the extent of the weakening of the Axis. The main tasks are still before us, and the penalty of the delays of 1942 means that there are still very great dangers in the position. The measure of success and new advance won by the end of 1942 needs to be seen against the background of the main failure of 1942. It is this partial success and partial failure of 1942 which has brought about the situation we have now to face for 1943, and which governs our tasks for 1943.

WHAT, then, is the outlook for 1943? There is a very wide confusion of expression, including from leading and authoritative sources, with regard to the perspective for 1943. Popular hopes and anticipations have been fostered by the type of publicity given to the initial successes in Africa, the governmental bell-ringing campaign, the emphasis on every sign of weakening of the Axis, as well as the successes of the Soviet winter offensive, and the stream of post-war talk and discussion almost displacing war appeals. This has given rise to tendencies to regard the back of the war as broken, "all over bar the shooting," victory as round the corner, and even to a sense of freedom to relax the tension of previous years and concentrate the main attention on home issues, sectional issues or post-war prospects. In contrast to the high level of the campaign for the Second Front during last summer, there has been perceptible a degree of dispersion of the mass movement—although the Second Front has not yet been won and the essential preconditions for victory have not yet been achieved. The danger of this is obvious, since it plays into the hands of Fascism and of all the reactionary friends of Fascism, distorts the true situation and imperils the very victory that is so confidently expected.

NOR has there been lacking encouragement from high quarters for expectations of victory appearing suddenly like a bolt from the blue in the not distant future. Thus General Smuts, on his return to South Africa, has been reported as saying on December 19:—

> Victory is assured, and the end may come sooner than we expect. It will come suddenly, smashingly, and victory will be there like the dawn, almost before we know it.

Unfortunately, unlike the dawn, victory is not a natural phenomenon which takes place at a predictable moment in accordance with natural laws independently of our effort or wills. Victory has not only to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be fought for; not only requires adequate strength to make it possible; but also requires such policies and such strategy as will ensure it. Delay of such policies and strategy, while we wait for the dawn, or pursuit of inappropriate and weakening policies and strategy (Darlanism, Die-Hardism in India, rejection of a united allied strategy, postponement of the Second Front) can seriously delay victory, heavily increase the cost in lives and suffering, bring only a maimed and crippled victory, with Fascism wounded and not killed, or even, if we fail to act to ensure changes in time, rob the world of the victory which millions of lives have already earned.

ON the other hand, an alternative line of official expression, while correctly warning against empty optimism or light-hearted assumptions of easy victory, lays all the emphasis on the insistence that victory must be "slow," and paints a grim prospect of "many years" of war before victory can be won.

> Do not let us be led away by any fair-seeming appearances of fortune. Let us rather put our trust in those deep, slow-moving tides that have borne us thus far already and will surely bear us forward —if we know how to use them—until we reach the harbour where we would be.
>
> I know of nothing that has happened yet which justifies the hope that the war will not be long or that bitter and bloody years do not lie ahead.
>
> —(Winston Churchill, broadcast, November 29.)

> He had been quoted as stating that the war would end in 1943. . . . It was very unlikely that the war would be won in 1943.
>
> —(Oliver Lyttelton, Minister of Production, speech at the Devonshire Club, December 16.)

> There will be many years of hard fighting before we get to victory.
>
> —(Admiral of the Fleet Sir Dudley Pound, speech to the United Nations Forces Fellowship Club, December 18.)

THIS variety and conflicting character of official expression on the perspective of 1943 is a revealing symptom of the lack of a clear, co-ordinated allied strategy and plan for speediest victory. The same discordance was visible a year ago in relation to the perspective of 1942, and developed into a serious conflict and crisis of allied strategy. We cannot afford to go through the same disastrous experience again. The real issue is not the question of opinions or predictions of the prospect of victory, of optimism or pessimism, complacency or realism. No man can predict the date of victory; we can only do all in our power to win it. But the real issue is the need of a concerted plan of allied strategy for all-out offensive action with the full strength of the alliance for the aim of speediest victory, that is, in the present concrete situation, for the aim of victory in 1943 by the speediest establishment of the Second Front in Europe and the mobilisation of the united people to achieve this aim. That is what is lacking; and it is this lack which produces, on the one hand, the dangerous tendencies to dispersal of effort and relaxation of tempo, and, on the other hand, the emergence of all the pro-Fascist rats and vermin to take advantage of the opportunity to gnaw away the victory before it is won.

BEHIND the confusion of perspective lie conflicts of policy and strategy. There is the strategy of the all-out offensive, which sees the African offensive as the springboard for the extension of the offensive to Europe and which sees the land front in Europe as the decisive pivot, in conjunction with the Soviet offensive, for the final crushing of Nazism in 1943. There is the alternative strategy which seeks to limit the present offensive and to reserve the main forces, which sees the African offensive as already the equivalent of the Second Front, and which makes its future calculations, not in terms of the land offensive in Europe as the decisive blow, but in terms of an air-bombing offensive, requiring years of prior preparation and accumulation, with a supposed passive enemy meanwhile, and intended to mature, not in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1943, nor even in 1944, but in 1945. Behind these questions of strategy lie political questions, objectives and alignments, as we have had occasion to see already in relation to the forces retarding the Second Front in Europe.

IT is necessary to face the facts plainly. In proportion as the balance of forces moves in favour of the United Nations, as the prospect of victory draws in view and the sense of immediate urgency and peril recedes, it is inevitable that all the reactionary anti-popular forces, who fear the final downfall of Fascism and the victory of popular freedom, should become increasingly active to delay and sabotage victory and to blunt the avenging sword of popular anger and hatred against the Fascist murderers and their agents. These gentry are not keen on the allied offensive in Europe—until such time as the question might arise, in Sir Samuel Hoare's phrase, of restoring "order" and imposing "garrisons" on Europe, in which case they would become violent partisans of the offensive in Europe. They are not in a hurry to see a too decisive or speedy anti-Fascist victory. They are not loath to see a prolongation of the present position, by which the main brunt of the fighting, so long as Fascism remains formidable, falls on the Soviet Union, with daily terrific loss in lives and resources, while Britain and the United States conserve their main resources and man-power for the future. They are prepared to suffer in a patient and philosophic spirit the wearing down and extending destruction of the working class and democratic forces in Europe by the daily intensified Nazi terror and persecution, while they counsel delay of action in the name of prudence and caution. They prefer to intrigue with a Darlan, an Otto or a Franco rather than that the peoples should play too active a part in their liberation, even though the former method inevitably prolongs the conflict and weakens the forces against Fascism. In short, from their standpoint the strategy of the long view has distinct advantages.

BUT for the same reasons the interests of the working class and the peoples are the direct opposite. The interests of the working class and the peoples are for the speediest ending of the war, for the speediest decisive victory over Fascism, for the maximum blows of all the strength of the peoples in association with the Soviet Union to win such speedy victory. Their interests are for a unified allied strategy (and not for the senseless caricature of that demand as if it were a demand for the conduct of the war by "a mass meeting" as the supposed only alternative to a discordant strategy), for the parallel offensive to the Soviet offensive, for the Second Front in Europe, for the liberation of India, for co-operation with the masses of the people and all truly national forces in all Nazi-occupied countries, for striking down the pro-Fascists and Fifth Column in Britain, for all the measures whose sum-total spells speedy victory. But for these measures it is necessary to fight; it is necessary for the Labour movement to play an active and responsible rôle, to end the passive assumptions of automatic victory or acceptance of inevitable indefinitely prolonged war and to respond to the new and urgent responsibilities which face us for 1943.

POLITICAL strategy is always intertwined with military strategy, but above all in war against Fascism. We have had abundant experience of this in every stage of the struggle against Fascism, from the days of Manchuria and Abyssinia, through Spain and Czechoslovakia and Finland, and now to-day over the question of the Darlan regime in Northern Africa, raising in initial forms the issue of all the Nazi-occupied countries. Behind the threadbare cloak of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military expediency reactionary policy pushes its interests. It is obvious that, in order to strengthen the military fight against Hitler, we should be prepared to make a pact with Beelzebub, if that would assist. But in this case military expediency is all the other way, as General Catroux very clearly showed. Darlanism in control in North Africa, with its Fascist administration and Fascist storm-troops and with the anti-Fascists in prison, is a very serious military danger for the allied armies, as the slightest sign of allied military reverses would rapidly reveal.

NO doubt it was also military expediency which compelled the State Department to appoint Archduke Otto, the Hapsburg pretender to the Austrian throne, to be in charge of the Free Austrian Battalion recruited in the United States and thus successfully repelled the many democratically-minded Austrians from joining it. It is not because of military expediency, but in spite of military expediency, that these reactionary policies are followed. Reactionary policy prefers the very feeble, venal and precarious support of a minute handful of upper class vermin to the democratic support of millions of combatant patriots, even though the rebuffing of the latter may prolong the war and cost more lives. It is not a question of a conflict between political strategy and military strategy. The best political strategy is the best military strategy.

SIMILARLY with regard to the present situation in India. Reactionary policy prefers to fight at a disadvantage, to rely mainly on imported troops or troops recruited from a tiny section of the population and with a largely passive or even hostile rear, rather than to mobilise the active co-operation of hundreds of millions of Indians at the expense of conceding liberty to India. The Viceroy can coolly declare in his year's review on December 17 that "it is because agreement cannot be reached between the conflicting interests in India that the deadlock has arisen." But when the political representatives of India ask permission to be allowed to meet in order to reach agreement, the same Viceroy uses the physical apparatus of coercion to prevent such a meeting. Here also it is the special responsibility of labour and democratic opinion in this country to break the deadlock and ensure a policy which will enlist the co-operation of the Indian people as a free people under their own leaders in the common struggle against Fascism.

SO, too, with the dangerous tolerance of the extending open campaign of Fascism and Anti-Semitism in Britain. The recent unanimous demonstration in the House of Commons in support of the solemn United Nations' declaration against Nazi Anti-Semitism and mass extermination of Jews was an impressive and sincere demonstration. But how much more impressive and effective the stand would be if these Ministers, Archbishops and other dignitaries would ever say a single word against Anti-Semitism in Britain or lead a campaign to stamp it out. Every one with eyes and ears must be aware of the recent marked increase of Anti-Semitic propaganda in this country; and every one with political intelligence must be aware that this is a political phenomenon, reflecting increased Fascist and Fifth Column activity in this country following on the release of Fascist detainees. The irony of circumstance decided that on the very same day on which the House of Commons made this demonstration against Anti-Semitism abroad, questions asked with regard to an openly Fascist and Anti-Semitic demonstration in the centre of London were met with polite unconcern by the Government representative and admonitions to the questioners not to get excited about such trifling matters.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT are we to say of an official policy which defends the refusal of admittance of Jewish refugee children from Nazi occupied countries into Britain on the grounds that this might offend Anti-Semitic feeling in this country? In a country where respectable newspapers freely carry advertisements "Gentiles Only," "No Jews," etc., without legal penalty, at the very same time as Anti-Semitism is officially recognised as the hall-mark of Hitlerism, it is evident that we are not only a long way below the civilised standards of the Soviet Union, with its constitutional enactments against any incitement to racial hatred, but we are also a long way from a serious war effort. For Anti-Semitism is only the outward sign of Fascism or the Fifth Column; and the real issue is the free tolerance of increasing Fifth Column propaganda in Britain at this most crucial moment of the war. This is a serious issue which the people will neglect at their peril.

THE present situation calls for sharpened political anti-Fascist consciousness, vigilance, fighting spirit and determination and the mobilisation of the people for the all-out offensive for victory. Many issues stand before the nation to-day. Important questions of post-war policy have come to the forefront of immediate political decisions, as in the case of the Beveridge Report on social insurance, the Scott and Uthwatt Reports on land utilisation, the proposed Education Bill, the negotiations with regard to post-war agricultural policy, the Industrialists' Manifesto, etc. On all these questions the labour, democratic and progressive forces must play their active part to ensure that the decisions reached shall serve the interests of democratic and social advance. But these post-war questions cannot be separated from the present vital issues of the war. The most important decisions of all that are now being reached are those that bear on present strategy in the war; for these will determine the post-war situation. Not only is the defeat of Fascism the pre-condition for all further democratic and social advance; but the unity, strength, political leadership and active rôle of the labour and democratic forces in responding to the present issues of the war will determine their capacity to achieve further advance after victory.

THAT is why the question of unity of the Labour movement is now of such cardinal importance, equally for speeding the offensive and overcoming the obstacles to the most rapid advance to a people's victory, and for the further issues of the post-war situation which already begin to develop in and through the war issues. For this reason the application of the Communist Party for affiliation to the Labour Party is of especial significance in the present situation, because it embodies in a concrete and immediate form the issue of unity of the Labour movement, and presents the rallying-ground for a campaign whose aim is no narrow question of the relations of particular parties and sections, but nothing less than the effective unity of the entire working-class movement to be equal to the gigantic tasks of the present epoch.

WE have a right to be confident at the opening of 1943, and to recognise the great and inspiring change in the situation from the opening of 1942. But we have no right to let that just confidence turn into exaggeration of the stage achieved, under-estimation of the enemy or failure to respond to the serious issues, political and strategic, which are now arising. If we bear in mind the extent of the territories, resources and populations under the control of the Axis, actually greater than a year ago and than at any previous point of the war; the line still held by Hitler in the Soviet Union, far

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more dangerously advanced than a year ago despite the magnificent successes of the Soviet offensive; the war production drive now being pressed forward in Nazi Europe, and the fortified preparations against future attack, assuming we let these go forward undisturbed, with the consequence that the Second Front in 1943 will inevitably be a heavier enterprise than it would have been in 1942; the fact that the real combined offensive of the United Nations, the combined offensive in Europe, has not yet begun; and the formidable extension of submarine warfare: it is evident that the present situation cannot be regarded as representing any automatic straight road to victory. It is still a critical and urgent situation.

WE are having to pay dearly for the delays of 1942. We must not repeat them in 1943. New dangers are arising: new dangers of delays which can fritter away the advantages of the initial successes won; of reactionary manoeuvres which can weaken the forces of the United Nations; of pro-Fascist and Fifth Column penetration which can disorganise the front at home; of over-confidence, relaxation of effort and distraction of attention, which can play into the hands of reaction. Only the fullest mobilisation of the people can defeat these dangers, and ensure the most effective utilisation of the great opportunities which now open out before us. We must therefore exert all our strength to be equal to our tasks in this culminating phase of the war; and we must direct our entire course to the supreme immediate aim of the all-out offensive for speediest victory of the peoples over Fascism during the coming year, and to the mobilisation of the united Labour movement and of the people for these tasks, conscious that, if we play our part, we can achieve our goal of victory in 1943.

R. P. D.

December, 1942.

The Beveridge Report

by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

THE long awaited Beveridge Report is now in circulation, and the various forces will soon be lined up for and against. The report represents a great piece of work and provides a comprehensive scheme of national insurance. But the question is already being asked by some workers. Is it just a piece of window-dressing which will never get further than the stage of a report? It would be fatal if such a cynical attitude affected our attitude to it. Nothing could be better suited to the desires of the powerful vested interests that are already preparing their attack on it. If the working class and progressive forces are determined to secure it, the Government will be forced to bring in the necessary legislation.

But even while we support the proposals in general, we must take note of and endeavour to strengthen certain parts that don't come up to expectations. The rates of compensation are too low. A single man or woman won't get very far on 24s., any more than a couple and one child on £2. If we are going to do the job in a big way, covering all sections of insurance, we may as well do it right and establish conditions that will put an end to the unnecesssary privations that have accompanied all of our schemes so far.

Regarding Workmen's Compensation the proposals are far from satisfactory. While it is true that a married couple will be better off than at present, the single person is going to be worse off, as the following table will show:—

	Present Compensation	Beveridge Rate
Single person	35/-	24/-
Man and wife....	35/-	40/-
Man and wife and one child	39/-	48/-
Man and wife and two children	43/-	56/-

The abolition of lump sum payments will put an end to what is known as "ambulance-chasing" and the chicanery

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and swindling that is so much associated with such payments. At the same time it should be noted that the scheme will not rule out "Common Law" cases.

But the most deplorable proposal is that in connection with the old age pensioners. It is a scandal that they should have still to battle with the infamous means test. It is shameful. As has often been said, there is no more deserving section of our community than men and women who have given fifty years' service in our mines, mills and factories or in our homes. They, of all people, are singled out as victims of the means test for another twenty-two years. Such unjustifiable discrimination must be fought against and the old folk brought into full benefit without delay.* At the same time as we fight against discrimination we must avoid the danger of being thrown into a position where we provide even the smallest measure of support for the big insurance companies. They will seize on every objection and pose as the friends of the neglected. They have had a long, long run with an exceptionally profitable racket and they won't give up without a fight. In this fight they will be without scruple. They will, if they can, use disappointed old age pensioners, they will instil the poison of doubt into the minds of cynical workers. Already the Kemsley press is coming out in defence of the insurance companies. All kinds of other vested interests, acting for the time being as a robber brotherhood, will throw their influence into the scales against the report.

The evidence given by the Employers' Federation, which is in the form of a statement in an appendix to the report, is a clear indication of the line this powerful organisation will take. According to it, social services involving a tax on industry, were the cause of much of our unemployment, owing to the heavy handicap they place on our foreign trade. Therefore there should be no guarantee given to the workers about conditions after the war, but rather we should wait on events and see what was possible.

That will be the attitude of the employing class as a whole when it comes down to brass tacks.

They forget that even with the social services the population is not keeping pace with the ravages of capitalist exploitation. Had it not been for the social services, the population would have been almost wiped out and capitalist industry would have come to a standstill. The social services have not only been a measure of insurance for the health of the people, they have also been a form, and a very necessary form, of insurance for the profits of the employers. There are no profits obtained from the residents of a sanatorium or the occupants of a cemetery.

All this is to be expected. The efforts will increase in volume with every day that passes. But if we are united we are strong enough to defeat the insurance companies, the robber brotherhood and the reactionary press. Can we get unity? Can we maintain unity? In the report Beveridge strikes hard at the insurance companies, though in a very gentlemanly way and with an appeal for their acceptance of his proposals. Their costs of administration are excessive, 7s. 6d. in the £. More than a third of the money paid in for insurance goes in administration. A racket! Yes, sir, a racket. And the racketeers will fight to the death to keep it going. While the main barrage will be through the reactionary press and various other forms of propaganda, they will have an army of sappers all over the country, seeking out every weak link in our forces and using it to break down our defences.

For the insurance companies have 80,000 employees, most of them collectors. These collectors don't see the possibility of an all-embracing and valuable national insurance scheme. All they see is that they are going to be thrown out of a job. It's the job they're used to doing. It's the job they know and they don't like the uncertainty that lies beyond it. We must win them over to an understanding of the use to which the insurance companies will put their fears. As they go from door to door, they can do great good or great harm. They can tell the truth about the racket, or, if they are dupes of the companies, they can exploit the discontent of old age pensioners and encourage apathy and cynicism on the part of other workers. The more workers neutralised, the easier becomes the fight of the vested interests

* A full list of the proposed benefits will be found at the end of this article.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is another feature of this report that will repay major consideration. That is the part relating to medical attention and health. This also, if it is to be truly successful, must be developed on the greatest and most far-reaching scale. It is not enough to have a call on the doctor when a member of the family is ill, or occasional examinations if they don't feel up to work. In all large factories, or for a group of adjacent small factories or pit, it will be necessary to establish full-functioning clinics with competent medical men in regular attendance. A group of socialist doctors, organised around the journal *Medicine, Today and Tomorrow*, have prepared a document on a national medical service that might well fit in with the Beveridge Report.

This is of the very greatest importance, for in the report itself we are told that there are three "Assumptions" in which the success of the proposed scheme depends. One of these is:—

> Comprehensive health and rehabilitation services for prevention and cure of disease and restoration of capacity for work, available to all members of the community.

This means that the day of wealthy, useless hypochondriacs wasting the time of medical men is over. The whole available skill will have to be organised into a great national service.

Another "Assumption" (the term is Sir William's) is children's allowances. This, which is proposed at the rate of 8s. a week for each child (where a married couple have only one child it doesn't apply), is not part of the insurance scheme, but is a liability which falls entirely on the State.

The third "Assumption" is, however, the one that will determine all the rest. It reads "Maintenance of employment, that is to say, avoidance of mass unemployment."

Amidst a number of opinions appearing in the press regarding the report, a young tory, Mr. De Chair, speaking for what he called the "young progressive Conservatives," welcomed the report, and said there would be no more need to talk of reconstructions. He couldn't have been further off the mark. There will be more need than ever to talk of reconstruction, for without fundamental changes it will be quite impossible to operate the scheme. In a talk with a group of lads down at the House, one of them said to me: "What is your attitude to the report?" "In general," I replied, "I will support it, but there are weaknesses I'd like to see eliminated." "Yes," said another of them, "it's a good foundation." "No," I answered him, "it's not a foundation at all, it's part of the super-structure and it won't stand up unless it has a good foundation under it."

With mass unemployment it would fall to pieces. That raises the all-important issue of the right to work. Without this right there is no right to a home, no right to property, no hope of social security. It is the root question that challenges all the fraudulent and humbugging claims of "private enterprise."

Sir Patrick Hannon, an old Conservative, a colleague of the young Conservative Mr. De Chair, spoke the other day at a meeting of shareholders in one or other of the many concerns he is associated with, informed us that there's going to be hard work and hard times when the war is over. But the hard toil and hard times won't be for Sir Patrick and his like. They will continue to live on the fat of the land while the masses toil and sweat for miserable wages or line up in queues at the Labour Exchange or the P.A.C. if we let them get away with it. But I don't think we will. Workers to-day, men and women, are toiling all hours of the day and night to save the people of the country from the menace of Fascist slavery. On sea, as on land, in the desert and in the air, the best of our young manhood brave the shock and fury of hell let loose. How they suffer, how they endure, no man without the experience can possibly estimate.

They fight, as the others work, to save our people from the menace of Fascist slavery. When this terrible war is over, when at last they return to their homeland and join once again in social life with their brothers of the factories, will Sir Patrick Hannon (I use him simply as typifying his class) have the right to say to one of these men, or one thousand of them, or to ten thousand of them, "Out on to the streets with you! I can't make a profit out of you. You're no damned use, get out!"

For that is the real and only meaning of private enterprise, the right to rob and exploit the masses of the people and the right to throw them on the scrap heap

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when they are no longer profitable. In face of the mighty achievements of the people of the Soviet Union, in peace and in war, is there anyone who would dare to say that "private enterprise" plays any useful part in the development of production? Even here in our country, since the war, it has become obvious to most people that "private enterprise" was fettering industry. The shop stewards have been kept busy during the past three years smashing these fetters and freeing industry from the clogging control of "private enterprise." "Private enterprise," the right to exploit the people for profit, cannot be tolerated if there is to be social security. The "Right to Work" without the leave of Sir Patrick, is the only sure basis on which the Beveridge scheme can be safely built.

We support the proposals, therefore, with that in mind. If we are strong enough to carry the one, we will be strong enough to secure the other. But all our strength will be required. Sir William speaks some wise words at the conclusion of his report, in the form of generalisations. We must give them particular application. He says: —

> Freedom from want cannot be forced on a democracy or given to a democracy. *It must be won by them.* Winning it needs courage and faith and a sense of national unity, etc.

The Labour Party is for the proposals, the Trade Union movement is for them, so is the Co-operative movement, so is the Communist Party. United, these represent the great mass of the people. United, these would inspire the faith and courage to overcome all obstacles. The future must be won now. Let us get together and win it.

The Beveridge Benefits

Below is a list of the benefits to which the different categories are entitled.

	Per week £	s.	d.
UNEMPLOYMENT, SICKNESS, DISABILITY AND TRAINING BENEFIT :—			
Man with wife not working	2	0	0
Man with wife working	1	4	0
Single man or woman, 21 and more	1	4	0
Single man or woman, 18-20	1	0	0
Boys or girls, 16-17	0	15	0
Married woman gainfully employed when herself on benefit ...	0	16	0
RETIREMENT PENSIONS (after transition period) :—			
Man and wife not working (basic)	2	0	0
Single man or woman	1	4	0
Man with wife working	1	4	0
Woman with husband below pensionable age (basic)...	1	4	0
Addition for every year of postponement to basic pension if one postpones retirement of :—			
On joint pension	0	2	0
On single pension...	0	1	0
MARRIAGE GRANT : Up to £10, according to number of contributions.			
MATERNITY BENEFIT :—			
For married woman employed for gain (for 13 weeks)	1	16	0
MATERNITY GRANT	4	0	0
WIDOWS' BENEFIT (for 13 weeks)	1	16	0
Guardians' benefit (basic)	1	4	0
DEPENDANT ALLOWANCE :—			
Dependant above age for children's allowance of person receiving unemployment, disability or training benefit	0	16	0
CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCE :—			
For each child when the responsible parent is on pension or benefit	0	8	0
For each child after the first in cases not on benefit, allowances graded by age, but averaging for all children	0	8	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FUNERAL BENEFIT :—

Adults	20	0	0
Age 10 to 20 years	15	0	0
Age 3 to 9 years	10	0	0
Under 3 years	6	0	0

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION :—

For total disablement : paid after first 13 weeks, two-thirds of assessed weekly earnings, but not more than £3 per week and not less than would have been paid as disability benefit and dependants' allowance, if any.

The Struggle of Occupied Europe

by QUAESTOR

IN the speech delivered by Stalin on November 6, 1942, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the victory of the Soviet Revolution, the following passage appears:—

The effect of the programme of action of the Italo-German coalition has been that all the occupied countries of Europe—Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece and the occupied regions of the U.S.S.R.—are burning with hatred of the Italo-German tyranny; are doing all the damage they can to the Germans and their Allies and are waiting for a favourable opportunity to take revenge on their enslavers for the humiliations and violence they are suffering.

In this connection, one of the characteristic features of the present moment is the progressively growing isolation of the Italo-German coalition and the depletion of its moral and political reserves in Europe, its growing weakness and disintegration.

The effect of the programme of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has been that all the occupied countries in Europe are full of sympathy for the members of this coalition and are prepared to render them all the help of which they are capable.

In this connection, another characteristic feature of the present moment is that the moral and political reserves of this coalition are growing from day to day in Europe—and not only in Europe—and that this coalition is progressively winning millions of sympathisers ready to join in the fighting against the Hitlerite tyranny.

The present is therefore all the more a time for considering what has been done by the Allies to consolidate the sympathy of these millions, and to give them direction and leadership so that their desire to join in the fighting against the Hitlerites becomes effective.

About the reality of the hatred of the subjected peoples for the Germans, and of their efforts to do the enemy all the damage they can, there can be little doubt. Every day brings fresh news of incidents which speak of the fighting spirit of the occupied countries.

In France the sublime act of self-sacrifice of the French navy at Toulon, blown up and sunk by its sailors to prevent its seizure by the Germans, has marked a turning-point. From the beginning of December onwards the sporadic acts of sabotage and assassination of German soldiers have developed into regular partisan warfare, conducted by properly organised detachments. It is very significant that their activity is particularly noted in the industrial heart of France—the Paris region, home of the great revolutionary traditions of 150 years of French history and the centre of the strongest Communist Party influence, as testified by friend and enemy alike. Partisan warfare in a great city is only the first of the brilliant new contributions to Europe's struggle for liberation which the heroic French people, now actively re-entering the struggle, is destined to make.

Every week brings fresh news of the struggle in Belgium and Holland—news unwillingly revealed by the enemy himself. Thus, on November 15 the Fascist leader in one district was assassinated as he was getting off a tram. On November 17 Henault, the Fascist burgomaster of Verviers, was assassinated. On November 19 and 20 two more local Fascists were executed by the people's avengers in various parts. On November 20, out of 18 persons tried by the Germans at Bruges for "espionage," 15 were sentenced to death. On the same day it was announced that the Germans executed 13 more on the charge of "favouring Communist activity." The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same picture applies in Holland. On November 16 15 persons were shot as reprisals for acts of sabotage all over the country. A few days later 15 others were shot at Arnhem for setting fire to storehouses, factories and farms and for acts of sabotage on the railways.

The heroic deed of the working people of tiny Luxembourg, in being the first of the occupied countries to carry through a general strike against the invaders, is still fresh in everyone's memory.

In Norway the sabotage of the Quisling regime forces daily admissions in the columns of the Nazi press itself. Thus, at Bergen the burgomaster complains to the local paper of receiving "heaps of anonymous letters threatening him with death" (November 25). In another place, the local Quisling newspaper complains that workers are being "terrorised" into not supporting the New Order, and adds (a frequent comment): "I have the impression that the terror is stronger here in Rjukan than in most other places." At Christiansand, on November 26, Quisling himself complained that "it is difficult to get on speaking terms with the workers." On November 26 and 27, in different parts of the country, it was reported that straw commandeered by the Germans had been delivered soaked with water, that school strikes were taking place, etc.

It is hardly necessary to recall the daily toll of executions by the Germans in Czechoslovakia. Scarcely a week passes without a corresponding list of acts of vengeance by the Czech people, measured by the corpses of German policemen and soldiers. It is important to note the spread of the movement to Slovakia, where the native agents of Hitler had skilfully played on nationalist and religious feeling to mobilise considerable forces for the Eastern front. On November 15, one of the Slovak Fascist leaders, Tuka, in a speech at Jilina, admitted that, as a result of the Allied landings in North Africa, there was talk in Slovakia that a second front had opened, "that the Germans will not be able to hold out, and that the end will be the same as in the last war." Three days later his colleague Tiso felt it necessary to answer in a public speech "those who anxiously ask 'why are we fighting our Slav brothers?'" During two days of the following week, there were four executions at Prague and six at Brno, while two German policemen were assassinated at Pilsen.

The Yugoslav guerilla movement developed into a first-class offensive force during the second half of 1942. In July, 100,000 guerillas took part in a series of simultaneous offensives, which in the course of one month freed thirty towns and several hundred villages, covering nearly all western Yugoslavia. They tied down in this way seventeen Italian, four or five German and four Hungarian divisions. The Fascists lost 10,400 killed and 4,700 prisoners. After a short period of reorganisation and regrouping, the guerilla attacks became still more formidable in September, more and more tending to come under a single strategy. The commander of the guerillas in Bosnia, Nagi, is a former captain in the Spanish Republican Army. On November 21 a Croatian Fascist paper was writing of "Croatia's battle area" and of "many painful blows" inflicted by the partisans. Two days before, the Conservative Swiss newspaper *Der Bund* wrote of the Yugoslav guerillas: "Should the Allies make a landing here, these partisans would be capable of giving them help of a different order from that which might be expected from the so-called national morale of all other occupied countries. . . Right inside the 'Fortress of Europe' there are active armed units which could serve to cover and form the spearhead of an Allied operation." Another Swiss paper, the *St. Galler Tagblatt*, stated on November 23 that the Serbian Fascist leader Nedich had lost 25,000 men in warfare with the guerillas, while the Croat Fascists had lost 40,000. The newspaper enumerated at least eleven separate formations of guerillas in various parts of the country, totalling 86,000 men, without innumerable local groups.

The above facts, taken from the news over a very brief period, could be multiplied many times over for all the countries of occupied Europe, if the space were available. They justify completely what Stalin said about the spirit of the invaded peoples.

What has been done by the Allies of the anti-Hitler coalition to organise and encourage this struggle?

The Soviet Union has never for a moment hesitated to support it to the utmost. Within a few weeks of the Nazi

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attack on the U.S.S.R. the Soviet Government signed agreements with the Polish and Czechoslovak Governments for units of their national armies to be formed on Soviet soil. Large Polish forces were in fact constituted and trained in the U.S.S.R., although for some reason the Polish Government then withdrew them instead of sending them to the front. Czech units are in process of formation. Furthermore, in its relations with Czechoslovakia the Soviet Government was the first to recognise, not only the cancellation of the Munich Agreement of 1938, but also the integral frontiers of the Czechoslovak Republic as they stood before Munich. Every Czechoslovak fighter at home and abroad now knows that, so far as the Red Army is concerned, he is fighting for land which will once again be his after victory, beyond any doubt, and as though Mr. Chamberlain had never existed.

The Soviet recognition of the Fighting French, as was noted last month, went farther at the time than any other similar Allied document. This was followed up immediately by the arrival of a large group of French airmen to fight in the ranks of the Red Army. General de Gaulle's organ in London, *La Marseillaise*, noted in its issue of December 13 the fraternal welcome given to the French fliers and their satisfaction at the equipment and conditions provided for them.

The Soviet Government was giving valuable assistance to the Norwegian fighters for their country's freedom many months ago, as Norwegians in London have declared. To-day its help to the partisans, headed by Larsen and operating in Northern Norway and Finland, is of very great significance. In this case as in many others, experience in more senses than one has proved the justification of Stalin's statement early in the war, on July 3, 1941, that "our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties."

How do matters stand with the other leading Allied Governments, those of Britain and the United States? The British Government placed British territory, either at home or elsewhere, at the disposal of the authorities driven from the occupied countries, as a base where they could reconstitute themselves and begin raising new fighting forces. It helped a number of these authorities to recruit, train and equip those new forces. It enables them to publish newspapers in Great Britain and to address their captive peoples through the B.B.C. The British Government has restored Ethiopia as a state and has notified the Czechoslovak Government that it regards the Munich Agreement as null and void—without, however, committing itself to the restoration of Czechoslovak territorial integrity. All these represent substantial contributions to the struggle of the European peoples. But they are far from adequate, either to those peoples' needs or to what Britain could do; and their effectiveness is very considerably hindered by a number of disquieting facts.

Of these, the outstanding and governing fact is that very influential groups, both in Britain and America, sometimes with Government authority and sometimes on their own, are still free to carry on intrigues, the objective meaning of which—whether they are intended as such or not is a secondary question—can only be to create forces among the Allies to act as policemen on behalf of reaction.

The most recent, flagrant and continuing case in point is, of course, that of France. Without repeating what was said on this subject last month, it is sufficient to note, in the absence of any guarantees that the semi-Fascist regime in North Africa has been changed, there is no reason to treat the forces which are being organised there under cover of American protection as other than a kind of pretorian guard, intended to play a sinister part when the Nazis are thrown out of France by the French people. It is not enough for the British Government to dissociate itself by implication from this policy, by handing over control of Madagascar to a representative of General de Gaulle: or by Mr. Eden promising in the House of Commons (December 16) that political prisoners detained for being pro-Ally may be liberated. The British Government has got to meet the cruel joke which was circulating among the Allies in London in December: "It seems that Hess arrived too soon."

The existence of subterranean reactionary and even Fascist influences in the ruling groups of the other western Allies

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has made itself felt more than once. Thus the Belgian Minister of Information Delfosse gave an interview to the anti-Soviet newspaper, the *Catholic Herald* (notorious for its support of Petain and Franco) which was a direct incitement to Belgian Catholics against the Labour movement (October 9, 1942). The existence of Fascist and anti-Semitic groups among the officers of the Belgian army in this country is a frequent source of complaint among the rank and file, and was brought out in a court martial in recent months. Again, it is not accidental that the Dutch Government hesitated for a full twelve months before proposing the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government: and that the principal opponent was the Foreign Minister himself, Van Kleffens. Only in the case of the Norwegian Government is there a more or less clean record, so far as democratic policy and friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. are concerned.*

A total contrast is presented by the Polish Government in London. It has the blackest of records among all the Allies in respect of tolerating anti-Semitic, anti-democratic and anti-Soviet propaganda and practices in its armed forces (up to the point of the beating up of Jewish and democratic soldiers). On the plea of "freedom of the press" its Censorship and Ministry of Information tolerate the existence of a perfect swarm of "unofficial" weeklies, fortnightlies and monthlies, of varying shades of opinion, but all united in this—that they carry on the most frenzied anti-Soviet propaganda. They spread lies about the alleged ill-treatment of Poles in the U.S.S.R., demand return of the liberated territories of the Ukraine and Belorussia to colonial slavery under Polish rule, spread incessant suggestions that there may be a separate Soviet-German peace: and all with complete impunity. In the first week of December the Polish National Council (a substitute Parliament of nominated members) in utter defiance of the Soviet-Polish Treaty which explicitly provided that the frontier question was to be held in abeyance until the end of the war, passed a resolution declaring: "In the question of our eastern frontier, the National Council holds to the basis of the Treaty of Riga" (*i.e.*, to the 1920 document by which, under pressure of military exhaustion, the Soviet Government was forced to agree to parts of Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Belorussia passing under Polish rule). At the same time, as was noted earlier, the Polish Government saw to it that the army raised in 1941 on Soviet territory, and with Soviet assistance, was not sent to the front to fight the Germans, but was withdrawn for some unexplained purpose to Persia.

What extensions this policy may lead to can be seen from the development of Polish-Czechoslovak relations. The restoration of Czechoslovakia's 1938 frontier would mean that the mining district of Teschen, inhabited by a Czech majority, but which the then Polish Government snatched when the Germans were taking their grab after Munich, would go back to Czechoslovakia. So far is the present Polish Government from accepting this position that it sent a strong protest to General de Gaulle when he notified the Czechoslovaks that the French National Committee regards the 1938 frontiers as in existence. Moreover, the Czechoslovak President was obliged in common justice to appoint a representative of Teschen to the Czechoslovak State Council. He was assailed for this in the most bitter terms by the Polish "unofficial" press; which nowadays writes quite openly of the Czechoslovak Government, or its pro-Benes majority, as agents of Moscow, *i.e.*, in terms substantially the same, if not quite as violent, as those which the Nazi press has used of Czechoslovakia ever since 1938.

It is difficult to say what attitude the British Government takes up towards Polish policy. One thing is certain: that General Sikorsky's Government could not exist for a day without British support, just as the "unofficial" newspapers could not be published in defiance of the British paper control.

* It must in fairness be recognised that the broadcast of Queen Wilhelmina on December 6, promising to call a conference for the reconstruction of the Dutch kingdom after the war, presents the opportunity, if not yet the absolute pledge, for a considerable advance of democracy in the Dutch Empire. In the conference "the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam and Curacao will take part with complete self-reliance and freedom of conduct for each part regarding its internal affairs, but with readiness to render mutual assistance. . . . This would leave no room for discrimination according to race or nationality."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By contrast can be mentioned the Czechoslovak Government, which in spite of political and class prejudices has proved itself able to come closer in spirit to its heroically battling people at home in the course of the last two years. The most outstanding symbol of this was the admission of a number of leading representatives of the Czechoslovak Communist Party to the State Council and to official positions connected with it. In spite of the known semi-Fascist and anti-Semitic inclinations of many Czechoslovak officers, particularly those who before 1938 were connected with the Agrarian or other semi-Fascist Parties, the internal spirit of the Czechoslovak army has also changed markedly for the better since 1941. Unlike the Polish Government, the Czechoslovak authorities don't mind their soldiers reading in their Army papers of the achievements of the Soviet people in the construction of Socialism.

It is all the more disquieting that the attitude of reactionary circles in this country and in the United States towards the Czechoslovak Government remains, to say the least of it, ambiguous. It will be remembered that many months passed before the British Government would even recognise the Czechoslovak authorities as a Government: and even yet they have not declared unambiguously for the restoration of the 1938 frontiers. Prominent and to some extent influential writers on post-war reconstruction of Europe—ranging from such people as Professor E. H. Carr, of *The Times* and the P.E.P. group to the fanatically anti-Soviet Mr. Voigt, of the *Nineteenth Century*—habitually treat of Czechoslovakia's claim to sovereign independence as a matter of light moment, to be swept aside in the interests of some fancied "federal" schemes for "Danubian unity."

Where this leads to can be seen in the bolder activities of the most rotten and discredited relics of pre-1914 Europe—the Hapsburg family, which once ruled that internment camp of nations known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire. At first the Hapsburg "Archdukes" resident in Great Britain were allowed considerable scope of propaganda, mostly in private, but occasionally venturing out into the press. This was mostly in Mr. Chamberlain's day. Later, when the Czechoslovak Government was recognised and particularly when friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. were restored, the Hapsburgs transferred their activity to the U.S.A., where no less a dignitary than the head of the house, Otto Hapsburg himself, is staying. For many months the official organ of the Austrian monarchists, the *Voice of Austria*, published first in New York and more recently in Ottawa, has been steadily, month in and month out, carrying on propaganda to blacken the name of Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak Government, and to preach the restoration of the Dual Monarchy under the Hapsburgs, in the name of "natural economic unity," "historic associations" and so forth. Quite lately the United States Government showed in this connection that its support of Darlan is not a mere accident of military necessity. Mr. Stimson, United States Assistant Secretary of State, sent birthday greetings to Otto Hapsburg, addressing him as "Otto of Austria"—a title ridiculed not only by the Czechoslovaks but by the thousands of democratic anti-Nazi Austrians living in Britain and the U.S.A. Moreover, while these democratic Austrians have been consistently refused the chance of forming their own military units to fight the hated Nazi oppressors of their country, the United States Government has lately allowed "Otto of Austria" to issue a call for the formation of an Austrian volunteer legion.

Much might be written of the attitude of British and American officialdom, particularly in the B.B.C. and the Foreign Office and State Department, to the rulers of enemy Powers like Italy, Hungary and Finland. It was most revealing that the Hapsburg *Voice of Austria* should bestow its approval, as on the right kind of political warfare, on the following statement by Mr. Elmer Davies, Director of the American Office of War Information, on October 2:

> Japan must be defeated, but we hope there are Japanese with whom we can deal. We know there once were friendly elements in Japan, and hope there still are. Our broadcasts have refrained from any reflection upon the Emperor, who, we believe, has been deceived by his military advisers.

Exactly the same attitude, it may be mentioned in parenthesis, is adopted towards Admiral Horthy of Hungary, one of the most infamous modern butchers of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his people, by the Hungarian section of the B.B.C.

But, to take one last example from among the Allies, the greatest ambiguity prevails with regard to Yugoslavia. For many months now it has been more and more definitely asserted, in the radio bulletins put out by the guerilla volunteers in Yugoslavia itself, that General Mikhailovich—War Minister of the Yugoslav Government in London, but operating himself in Yugoslav territory—plays little or no part in the armed struggle of the Yugoslav people against the Nazis, and that in fact the greater part of his irregular forces, known as Chetniks, are co-operating with the enemy against the guerillas. The reason for this is not far to seek; the terrorist dictatorship of the Serbian landowners and businessmen over a country ripe for agrarian revolution, which existed right up to the spring of 1941, had not had time to be profoundly modified when the Germans invaded the country. This left military men at the head of affairs, even in the anti-Nazi Yugoslav Government formed by Dr. Yovanovich, for whom an armed peasantry spells the end of all things. They denounce the peasant guerillas as "bandits," and General Mikhailovich's colleagues in the Yugoslav Government, both in London and at Washington, persist in attributing all the defeats of the Fascist plans in Yugoslavia to him. On the other hand, the war bulletins of the Yugoslav peasant guerillas, mentioned earlier, almost daily refer to their never-ending fight against Mikhailovich's troops. Thus, the communique of October 5 from the "Free Yugoslavia" radio station mentioned co-operation of Chetnik troops with the German and Croat Fascist forces in the Benjalaika sector of Bosnia. On October 7 a special communique reported a protest to the International Red Cross by a conference of fifty medical officers of the guerillas against the inhuman treatment of prisoners by the Germans, Croat Fascists and Chetniks. On October 12 the communique spoke of a reign of terror established throughout the whole of Southern Dalmatia by the Chetniks, burning entire villages and slaughtering unoffending people.

This development cannot surprise people who followed Yugoslav internal politics before 1941. But as mentioned earlier, the attitude of the British and American Governments must at best be called peculiar. Thus, in face of detailed reports from the guerillas, and without any attempt by the Yugoslav authorities in London to produce anything similar as evidence of Mikhailovich's activities, the British War Office rushed into print on December 12 with a request to the Yugoslav Government to transmit their congratulations to the Chetniks and to Mikhailovich "who continues to harass the enemy daily and nightly under the most difficult conditions."

One thing is necessary to bring into action the growing moral and political reserves of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition mentioned by Stalin, in the speech of November 6: that the British and United States Governments, by deed as well as word, make it clear that they aim in fighting Nazi Germany to give the European peoples a real and effective chance, not one merely on paper, to restore their freedom. They must be pressed to give the most explicit guarantees that they are not preparing forces for a new Holy Alliance of reaction in Europe after the war.

INDEX TO 1942

THE INDEX TO VOLUME XXIV for the year 1942 of the LABOUR MONTHLY, divided according to authors and subjects, is now ready.

The index will be sent to individual readers on receipt at the LABOUR MONTHLY office of a stamped (2½d.) addressed foolscap envelope.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French People will Choose

by JEAN BAUDRE

[*We have pleasure in printing this article from one of the Fighting French, who reached Britain two months ago.*—ED. L.M.]

A DEFINITE question is put to me: "What did the 40,000,000 French think of Admiral Darlan's presence at the head of North Africa, liberated by the Allies?" I shall attempt to give an answer to this question with my eyes fixed on those whom I left a short time ago—the workers and the peasants of France.

As I begin this article I have before my eyes this picture: I see myself once more at Marseilles about January, 1942, strolling along the quay, drinking in the cafés that face the docks, and seeking to get into conversation with the greatest possible number of seamen.

I am not doing this through mere idleness, but in order to gather information about the movements of ships. My object is to find a way to leave France and reach England.

In front of the dock gates there are many policemen. Policemen or soldiers, who knows? Anyway, they are mounting guard. They wear a uniform unknown to me, of a dark colour. I question a docker and treat him to a drink. "Those are the 'Darlans,' " he answers. "They are members of the new special police whose job is to guard the port. Darlan created them recently and so we have baptised them with his name. It is well deserved, for they really are beasts. Their work consists in preventing secret embarkations, which, in any case, do not lead a man who wants to leave France for England to any place useful for carrying out his plan and in addition have become impossible. The 'Darlans' must also watch the goods which arrive by boat from Africa and ensure their safe loading upon the wagons bound for Germany. They search the workers who leave the docks. Woe to the man who has hidden a handful of corn or a few olives in his pocket! The repression is merciless.

"So, with an empty stomach, and knowing that our kids at home are starving, all day long we load supplies on their way to Germany! And Darlan's special agents are there to watch us."

I think this memory gives an answer to the question which is put to me. The name of Darlan was surrounded with hate. His unpopularity was only exceeded by that of Pierre Laval.

It is, in fact, under the Darlan Government that all kinds of police were created and perfected, which have muzzled France and spread terror. I have just mentioned the guards of the port of Marseilles. Alongside them we have the "guards of roads and communications," created towards the middle of 1941, whose task it is to watch the roads and the railways, both in the unoccupied and occupied zones.

These road-guards generally live in medium sized towns or even in little communes on the chief roads and railway lines. They inspired the population with great terror. For, in the railway stations, they opened and searched the modest food parcels which the people of France, stricken with famine, try to obtain from friends or relations in the country.

Here is an anecdote worth relating: One evening, as I was sitting in the back shop of a small café, awaiting the time to listen to the French radio from London, the owner of the place suddenly came in, accompanied by one of these road-guards.

I was annoyed, for I thought I would have to give up my idea of listening to the British radio, but the owner said: "You can 'get London' together." Amazing! This road-guard was pro-British! He was an Alsatian who had accepted this post in order to earn a living. But he too, as he told me, was impatient to pursue the fight against the Germans. He too hated Darlan. He explained to me that, besides the policy of collaboration of which he disapproved, he had special reasons to hate his chief: he was ashamed of the work he was obliged to do. If he compelled the housewives to open their parcels, it was with reluctance; but he had to obey orders. But who was responsible for these orders, superior to the Minister of the Interior, the brutal Pucheu, if not his chief Darlan?

Besides, Darlan was proud of his police. He had founded a special school which he liked to visit. Everywhere in France he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had ordered large posters to be put up, showing a policeman, well fed, muscular, magnificently clothed, a real insult to the widespread poverty of the French. This poster enumerated the benefits offered to policemen, with the aim of winning more enrolments in the state police.

Indeed, Darlan knew that his policy was not popular and that the only way he could last was to rely on violence. He was not mistaken about the real feelings of the French people towards him. How could he delude himself when, towards January, 1941, while visiting a youth camp, he had been received with regular hooting?

One day, on a platform in the station at Toulon, I heard the reflections of the public when his special train stopped in the station for a few minutes. Not one remark was in his favour.

And yet, towards the end of 1940, he had come to power under the best of conditions. France had been shocked by the Montoire interview. She made Pierre Laval bear all the reproach of it.

They soon had to change their tone. Laval's dismissal in December, 1940, and his replacement had only been internal politics, a mere palace revolution, as in the dictator countries. For Admiral Francois Darlan followed the same anti-British and pro-German policy as Laval.

The public understood this perfectly. The private conversations, which so amazingly replace the muzzled press in the dictator countries, had informed them upon which forces Darlan relied: those of big capitalism.

The past history of Darlan's ministers and what they stood for was soon learnt—big banks, heavy industry, insurance companies. At least six of these ministers were attached, directly or indirectly, to the same armament and mining group associated with the Worms Bank.

Now to conclude: I myself lived in France in one of those admirable popular centres whose courage in resistance is an example of what love of freedom, fatherland and honour can give. These sentiments are deeply rooted in the French masses, who were betrayed from 1940 to 1942 by the so-called bourgeois élite of their country, for pure class reasons and reasons of internal politics. When my friends knew that I was leaving for England many of them enjoined me, in a picturesque style: "Above all tell them, in London, not to allow *them* to change sides again." By "*them*" they meant the men of Vichy.

I immediately understood the meaning of these words, for we often used to talk about it amongst ourselves. We were afraid that, when an Allied victory was certain, Vichy would gradually change, become transformed, camouflaged, would try to disguise its true feelings and make the best of a bad job, in order to retain power after an Allied victory. This transformation France, the real France, the one which has always fought with the Allies under the occupation and the terror, does not accept nor ever will.

That is what "les Francais de France" bade me demand of the Allies. I must therefore put them on guard against the sincerity of a tardy evolution by the collaborationists of yesterday. The more the Vichy leaders who have helped the Germans pretend to-morrow to be Anglophiles and friendly to the Allies, the more we must distrust them.

For if their so-called "waiting policy" and their collaboration with Germany had been a simple wartime ruse, they could have acted otherwise. To take two examples, while pretending to arrest Frenchmen acting against the invader, as the Germans demanded, they could have reserved for them an easier fate, or even facilitated their escape. In military matters, they could have helped soldiers and officers in the army who resisted to conceal their arms. They did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they often rushed in in advance of the German wishes. Their belief in a German victory was very great; they desired it to keep their jobs. They were opportunists, indeed; but opportunists with a clear preference for Germany on account of her internal regime.

To-day, taking account of services rendered at the eleventh hour to the Allied cause, ex-collaborators who repent could be assured of personal safety and a rest. But let them at least have the decency to disappear from the scene. There, if the question were asked, is what the French people would reply.

But the French would assuredly not agree that the ex-collaborators should appear as liberators, having at first chosen to be hangmen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Prospect in 1943

by GEORGE ALLISON

THESE past twelve months of 1942 have been a crucial year for the people of Britain.

Hence the responsibilities which the year 1942 placed upon the British Labour movement were such as it never had to carry at any previous time. Thus under these circumstances it is important to review the main activities of the Labour movement in the past year.

During these twelve months there have been notable developments in the organised working class. Its organisations, with few exceptions, have greatly increased in size. The ranks of the working class have been swelled by new millions of entrants into industry: and the Trade Unions have grown greatly, especially in the munitions industries. The growth in numbers has been accompanied by an increase in the strength of the movement and by a great increase in activity. But, despite the increase in numbers, strength and activity, a review of the period shows that the Labour movement, though developing, was not yet rising to the height of its possible performance, or fulfilling to the maximum the part that it could play.

The central issue of the year was the need for a unified allied strategy. It found expression in the concrete demand for the opening of the Second Front in Europe as a means to the speediest victory. Political activity over this issue in all working-class organisations was reflected in March in the unprecedently large demonstration in Trafalgar Square, only to be exceeded by the still greater demonstration in May. At this latter demonstration, held in connection with the National Conference of the Communist Party (which at that point more than doubled its membership since the beginning of the year), fifty thousand men and women unanimously held up their hands for a resolution in support of the Second Front and other measures for victory in 1942. Nevertheless, this rapid development was not reflected everywhere. It is significant that this burning issue was left on one side by the Labour Party Conference in May; and that at the Congress of the Co-operative Union a plea by one of the delegates for a clear statement on the Second Front was dismissed by the Chairman of the Co-operative Party with scant courtesy.

The Trades Union Congress discussion marked an advance from the stage reached at the Labour Party Conference.

Undoubtedly Congress would have voted decisively on a straight issue. As it was 1,526,000 did go on record for the immediate opening of the Second Front against a vote of 3,584,000 in favour of the Second Front, but leaving time and place in the hands of the "competent authorities." In this way the leadership of the T.U.C. side-stepped the pressure of organised opinion and renounced responsibility for carrying the political struggle into the opponents' camp.

Far from settling the issue, the T.U.C. decision served to feed the campaign in the factories and local Labour organisations, resulting in a high degree of local action and an increasing volume of pressure on the Government.

The fight for a unified allied strategy came near to success, but did not attain it in 1942. With the new situation of offensives in North Africa and on the Eastern Front, the main question now shifts to this: that the Labour movement should learn the lesson of this past year and apply still greater energy and drive to the support of the African and other campaigns as steps to an offensive against Hitler's vital centres. Apart from new questions of conduct of the war, these offensives will demand the driving force of the working class also for sustained and increased production.

Nowhere has the initiative and resource of the working-class movement been more manifest than in the sphere of production.

Persistent campaigning and the formation of workers' production committees led, in many factories, to joint committees embracing the management and subsequently to Government approval of Joint Production in all the key war industries. Now, throughout the country, in the coalfields, in engineering, aircraft, munitions factories and the shipyards, the Joint Productions Committees are everywhere recognised as playing a vital part, although in many cases the employers still offer stubborn resistance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Trades Unions are not fully drawn in.

The achievements in the sphere of production are already beyond expectation. By practical application to specific problems, bottlenecks are eliminated, manpower and machines are being used to better advantage and radical reorganisation is being carried out to general advantage. Experiences already gained are killing the theory that production can be raised only by longer hours and sweated labour.

On the coalfields since the introduction of the Production Bonus output has been increased by 2,000 tons per week and is still rising. Avoidable absenteeism is still serious, but further efforts by the miners to close the gap between supply and needs would certainly produce better results, were there a greater measure of co-operation by colliery managements.

Much the same can be said of the other vital war industries and transport. Low wages, bad travelling facilities and a sense of frustration arising from managerial inefficiency not only put a brake on the production drive, but all too often have recently led to strike action.

The political urge that comes from a clear understanding of what is involved is the means of introducing higher forms of self-discipline in the factory and active co-operation on the part of the employers is a big asset in the fight against absenteeism. Above all, as shown by production weeks organised to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet State, the drive for production is closely allied to the course of the war and the strategy employed by the Government. Now that the war has entered into a new phase involving greater effort, the problem of production takes on a greater significance. The need for the utmost effort to ensure complete success in the African offensive is already keenly appreciated in industry. Here it is noteworthy that, while the main urge for new official Production Drives confront the factories and the pits, Trade Union Branches and District Committees, Trades Councils and Joint Trade Union Production Committees are carrying the proposal a stage further.

It is true that much remains to be done. In whole areas and many large and important factories, the work has scarcely started and too often the Union machinery functions half-heartedly.

But the progress made in 1942 is the best incentive to further efforts aimed at bringing the Trades Councils, Union Branches, District Committees and National E.C.'s solidly in behind the drive to speed up production and transport to meet the exacting requirements of the war situation in 1943.

The removal of the ban on the *Daily Worker* has a special significance for the Labour movement, not only because the paper has already vindicated its place in the war effort, but because the movement generated in the campaign for the release of the paper is perhaps the most widespread and persistent action carried through the working class organisation. Success did not come easily and at every stage bitter opposition came from Transport House and prominent leaders in Trade Unions, the Co-operative organisations and the Labour Party. It was only after nineteen months' campaigning during which more than 2,000 resolutions of protest had been passed, that the last barriers of resistance were broken down, and in the last analysis it was the sheer weight of working class opinion expressed through the official channels of the movement that carried the day. The Co-operative Union Congress, representing over 8,000,000, protested against the method of suppression and in the same week the Labour Party Conference went a step further by carrying a straight resolution for the lifting of the ban. In no sense could either of these be regarded as snap decisions, and as the opening date of the Trades Union Congress drew nearer it was universally recognised that the issue was a foregone conclusion because of the preponderant vote of the key unions.

What is still more important is the high degree of working class unity developed in the course of the fight. At various stages in the campaign attempts were made through official pronouncements to prevent the working class organisations from taking active participation. The effort was negligible. Unity was built to such an extent that the National Day of Deputations to Parliament on July 29, which brought together 1,500 delegates from all sections of the Labour move-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment—Labour Mayors, Co-operative directors, national and district Trade Union representatives, Labour Party and Trades Council delegates—was a classic example of the strength and virility of democracy.

There are healthy signs that the local organisations are looking more to the Trades Councils for a lead on the day-to-day issues that arise. The provision of crèches and nursery schools, transport, British Restaurants, shopping facilities, are only a few of the problems that have to be tackled on a local basis. They provide an immediate basis for the development of unity of action.

It is a reflection on the working class and democratic movement that the Government policy on India has not called forth a more serious challenge. The Labour Party Conference meeting just after the failure of the "Cripps Mission" was able to get a unanimous vote on a resolution that entirely evaded the problem. Three months later, with little opposition, the General Council of the T.U.C. was able to get endorsement of Congress for the Statement issued in August, which virtually condoned the action of the British Government and threw the onus of responsibility on to the leaders of the Indian people.

It inevitably follows from the new war situation that the whole Labour movement is called upon to play a more decisive part, and everything that stands in the way of full-flooded co-operation must be ruthlessly swept on one side. New sacrifices will be necessary, industry will have to stand up to the double strain of the new call-ups and the much heavier demands on productive resources. Above all is it necessary to rouse the whole movement up to a grim realisation of the fight that is being waged. Arising from this will come a willingness to make legitimate sacrifices and a keener appreciation of the need for stamping out everything that stands in the way of the most vigorous prosecution of the war.

On the economic field there are many problems demanding immediate solution. Wages are a burning issue. The Tribunal award of a 5s. weekly increase made recently to the railway employees does not meet the needs of the lower paid trades. Similarly, the small concession made to women in engineering does not make for the rapid recruitment of women into the industry. This problem demands an early solution and a unified policy on the part of all the Trade Unions concerned, because all experience goes to show that women can and will in the very near future be called upon to play an even bigger part in the principal war industries. Problems of transference, workshop rates and conditions are a source of continual irritation which too frequently in the recent past have been allowed to lead to strikes and the slowing down of production.

This is aggravated by the refusal of many firms to sanction and take part in local production committees; the stubborn refusal of large sections of the employers, even now, to recognise trade unionism; and the fact that the Trades Union Disputes Act, 1927, remains on the Statute Book unamended, because, in the words of the Prime Minister himself, "I am now in possession of the view of the Conservative Party and I wish to represent as strongly as possible that the matter should not be pressed particularly at this critical period of the war."

A solution of these and similar problems will go a long way towards removing doubts and misgivings still lingering in the minds of the workers and will cut the feet from under the sinister activities of the Trotskyists and the I.L.P., who seize on genuine grievances deliberately to develop industrial strife and hamper the war effort.

The solution of these problems is primarily the job of the vanguard in the Labour and Trade Union movement. They demand increased activity and the highest measure of unity.

The progress made in 1942 towards the establishment of real working-class unity has got to be carried forward in the coming year. If the will of the movement is expressed through official channels and unity in action is established from below on local issues, reactionary influences will be unable to withstand the pressure. A united Labour movement is the surest basis upon which national unity can be founded, and the most effective guarantee that Britain will honour its obligations to her allies and the forces of democracy now rising to the struggle against Fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Outlook for 1943

by R. G. GOSLING

IF I said that 1943 was pregnant with possibilities I would be merely indulging in a Churchillian riddle.

This is not the time for such playful political pronouncements, but for sober reflection on the course of the war and for determined resolve as to our future actions.

Experience has taught us that we must be vigilant to avoid any diversionary tactics as to the purpose of this war, namely, the destruction of Nazism and Fascism. Nor must we allow to go unchallenged any imperial, industrial, political or economic policy which harms the unity of the United Nations and the chance of final victory in 1943.

There is no rival to the Prime Minister as Leader, but the loyalty shown to him, despite all past political differences, must not allow clouds which blow up to pass unnoticed. In particular, his Mansion House speech in comparison with Chiang Kai-shek's pronouncement; the Government's Indian policy with its international reactions; and the solidarity of the U.S.S.R. as compared with the continued difficulties created by vested interests here, all have to be watched and met.

We have much on which to build and transcending all others is the great flood of sympathy, understanding and admiration which has enveloped the peoples of the earth at the endurance, courage and tenacity of the people of Russia.

1942 has seen an international solidarity born from human understanding. There should be no errors in the methods by which we utilise that feeling for the future.

1943 can see the end of hostilities in Europe despite the fact that it will probably be necessary to see the end of the German Army on German soil and despite the possibilities of a Japanese attack on the U.S.S.R.

Production, unquestionably, is a primary factor.

In its realism the Co-operative Movement has proved itself a great weapon of the people. Its methods have assisted and can still further assist, towards. a 100 per cent. productive policy. The injustices of our economic system have been ameliorated by Co-operative action, and its vast retail and productive undertakings have been utilised with a full understanding of the needs of to-day.

It has fought for complete rationing from the outset; it has been unrelenting in its opposition to the Purchase Tax; it has placed its technicians and experts, its factories and knowledge, at the disposal of the Government, and, whilst it has carried out voluntary concentration schemes to release space and labour, it has insisted that it should not be compelled to make adjustments proportionately greater than capitalist organisations.

Whilst rationing still remains incomplete and some notable successes have been scored in freeing necessities from Purchase Tax, political bias has operated against the sane use of the Co-operative Movement and its methods.

With its membership of the National Council of Labour, its influence in favour of freedom of thought and utterance, and its opposition to proscription will be important.

War is, however, a great educator and the use of the 1844 device of dividend on purchases for communal purposes to aid Russia and China and the elementary need for closer economic unity within the Co-operative Movement will probably cause great changes in the months that lie ahead.

The unanimous support given to the campaign for the removal of the ban on the *Daily Worker*, followed by the financial support accorded, showed that the Co-operatives had retained their sense of justice in a world of insensate prejudices.

Big fields of distribution yet remain to be conquered and if we can utilise the great spirit within the movement during 1943, we will do much to translate the lives of the people towards a new plan of economic justice.

25 per cent. of the tea, sugar, bread and milk consumed in this country passes through the Co-operatives; 15 per cent. of the national points coupons pass over Co-operative counters and a very high percentage of the coal, meat and dry goods trade can also be claimed. On the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

productive field, the C.W.S. had become the largest manufacturers of furniture; its manufacture of soap, margarine, butter and many other domestic needs were important and growing, whilst new fields were opening. The Scottish C.W.S. had entered into the production of electric lamps and the C.W.S. were developing very large operations in radio, electrical and other appliances.

The success of all these developments post war will depend upon the standard of retail sales and the development of outlets. If 1943 sees the retail movement attracting a greater proportion of the consuming public, then a firm and solid basis will be available for vast extensions.

We have to plan for an age of plenty and not for an era of capitalist restrictive monopolies. The alliance of China, the U.S.S.R., U.S.A. and this country sees a great and glorious opportunity of enriching the peoples of the earth.

Co-operative associations have existed for years between each of these countries; with the U.S.S.R. sound co-operative agreements could be developed. The movement in the States has shown itself no laggard and its entry into the fields of oil production and refinery shows great promise. China has utilised Industrial Co-operatives as the background for a new economy which is proving itself in the crucible of war.

My last contribution to this Journal was a Review (1937) of "Consumers Co-operation in Great Britain" by three professors, assisted by numerous economists, who had been invited by the Co-operative Wholesale Society to survey the movement and say what they thought.

It is still a great work and the unbiased and friendly pronouncements on the movement's economic future are inspiring to the determined worker. Much remains to be done, but Co-operators have a duty to advance amalgamations and federal and district developments towards an economic unit in their own particular area to develop a degree of loyalty leading to 100 per cent. trade through the wholesale organisations and the working out of democratic machinery towards an improved national movement.

None of these things is impossible and all are urgently necessary for, despite past triumphs, the real tests are yet to come.

The "National Policy for Industry" (by 120 business men) indicates their desire to tie up the Co-operative movement with capitalist industry and the proclamations of the Federation of British Industries and of the National Association of Chambers of Commerce also show the fate of the Co-operative movement if it is not prepared to resist the supremacy of private enterprise after the war.

The British movement has shown that it holds a policy suited to the needs of the people. Organising a large approved society, it told the Beveridge Committee in its Memorandum that if the policy which it urged meant that Approved Societies should go, then Approved Societies must go.

There is no dubiety in the minds of all leading Co-operators and we must all resolve that there is no dubiety in our actions.

BOUND VOLUMES 1921-1941

We are continually receiving requests for bound volumes for earlier years which we are obliged to refuse, as we have not the loose copies available to make up sets. Can readers help to supply the shortage? The numbers required are :—

1921, 1922, 1923 } All numbers.
1924 : March, December.
1925 : May, December.
1926 : March.
1929 : March, December.
1930 : All except February.
1931 : August, September, December.
1932 : March.
1933 : March, May.
1934 : April, October.
1936 : December.
1938 : July.
1939 : All except March, November, December.
1940 : January, February, March, November.
1941 : June. (With covers on.)

We will pay for copies of these months returned in good condition before the end of this month.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Miner looks at 1943

by ABE MOFFAT

(President, Scottish Mineworkers' Union)

THE year 1942 finished with a new phase in the war. All the Allies, for the first time since the war began, were engaged in offensive operations which creates an entirely new situation. The miners all over the country have been inspired by the successful offensive of the 1st and 8th Armies against the enemy.

This new offensive is in line with the policy of the miners and their Trade Unions, who were in the forefront in demanding offensive action. It is gratifying to know that the offensive is expanding and miners will, in accordance with this policy, decided at the Annual Conference of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, look forward to the offensive being expanded right into the heart of Europe for the final destruction of Hitler Fascism.

It must be understood, however, that it is not sufficient to pay tribute to this new phase of the war unless we realise that this requires the maximum production of coal—as was also decided upon at the Miners' Annual Conference. The year 1943 will undoubtedly bring new offensives and very heavy battles. Enormous losses will take place in casualties, loss of tanks, guns and planes, and they can only be replaced by more and more coal. While we pay tribute to the new offensive and expect it will be developed into Europe, we, as miners, must also accept our full responsibility to ensure that there shall be no shortage of coal in the battles that lie ahead. It is our working class duty to ensure that the armed forces of Britain will be supplied with the ammunition, fuel and food and that we meet our obligations to our Soviet Allies, which has been a long standing pledge by the miners of Britain. Those who stand in the way of this being done are not loyal to the miners, to the British working class or to those fighting in occupied countries or to our brave Soviet Allies.

If we understand this main issue, then we can mobilise all our forces in the coalfield to carry out a powerful offensive that will scrub away every obstacle that stands in the way of increased production, so vitally necessary for the defeat of Fascism.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL

To overcome the gap that still exists between consumption and production, it is necessary to review the short period in which the mines have been under Government control. There are two tendencies prevailing in the mining industry. These are certain sections of the owners, who would not, under any circumstances, like to see any control being a success. They look to the future in the hope that they shall carry on in the old way when the mining industry will be solely under this individual control, which would only lead to chaos and disaster for the industry and the mines. Similarly, we have tendencies in our own ranks who sow distrust towards any form of Government control under the smoke screen that only by nationalisation can we increase production. This tendency goes so far as to suggest that the various boards that are being set up is a kind of Fascist legislation and will be used after the war to keep down the miners. This policy can become very dangerous in the present situation and assist those who want to prevent any further development in Government control in the mining industry which should be recurring in the near future.

It is true that certain weaknesses have been revealed in the control, but that is not a reason for playing into the hands of reaction. It is all the more reason why the weaknesses should be exposed, but at the same time, why we should use all the power we have got under the control, whether it be in Regional Coal Boards or Pit Production Committees, to ensure maximum production of coal for victory over Fascism—the main task of all miners and all those who stand for progress.

Miners will welcome the fact that at least, under the present Control, we are going to have for the first time since 1926 a National Wages Board governing wages and conditions.

The Control also provides for a National Coal Board being set up to go into the whole question of coal production in the whole British coalfield. If we are sincere in our policy, if we believe that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the extension of Government control will be necessary in the future, then we must take the necessary steps to establish the National Coal Board as laid down in the White Paper, so that the whole question of coal production can be discussed as a national question.

BUILD AND STRENGTHEN THE TRADE UNION

There are a few in our ranks who are sceptical in accepting the policy of the Miners' Federation and even go to the length of refusing to carry out the policy. They contend that we, as miners, are being asked to make too much sacrifice and we will go through the same terrible experience after the war is finished as was done after the last war. This is a policy of bankruptcy, disaster and complete lack of faith in our own strength and power. The Miners' Federation have shown that they are capable of defending the interests of the miners at the same time as carrying out a policy for increased production. At present they are raising a very important question for all injured miners in demanding that they be paid all the war wage increases in addition to their compensation.

Any sacrifices we have made are very small compared with the sacrifices of the 1st and 8th Armies who have died in their thousands; or with the miners in the Donetz Basin, who destroyed their own mines rather than allow them to go into the hands of Hitler Fascism; or with the French sailors who preferred death to national dishonour. The miners in this country have shown the same courage when faced with danger, in disasters and when their comrades have been entombed. Coal owners and their profits did not prevent miners facing death and working like Trojans to save the lives of their comrades who were in danger. To-day millions of people of our class are in danger and we require to carry forward the courage of the miners in the past by overcoming all obstacles that stand in the way of increased production so that we can rescue the millions of the people, including ourselves, who stand in great danger in the present situation.

We can further safeguard the interests of the miners now and in the future by using the legacy that has been handed down to us by our forefathers. We have inherited from them the Trade Union movement and without sacrifice. We have the right and duty to hand down to the younger generation a more powerful Trade Union, which can only be done by again carrying out the policy of the Annual Conference of the Miners' Federation to establish the Miners' Union for the whole of the British coalfield. This is the best guarantee to ensure that conditions and wages will not return to the pre-war days.

To make sure that all this will be done we must play our full part in bringing about the defeat of Hitler Fascism. Let us resolve that in 1943 we shall produce the coal for our own lads in the armed forces who will be engaged in heavy battles along with our gallant Allies, the Red Army. Let us carry out our working class duty without hesitation or any reservations, recognising that we have a duty towards our lads who are giving their lives so that we can stand up as free men, building our Trade Unions to carry forward the fight for better wages and conditions and for complete freedom and security. Let 1943 be the year of great offensives at the front and in the pits for the final destruction of Fascism, the greatest enemy of the miners and of all mankind.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anti-Soviet Filth

by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

THERE is a new and sinister wave of anti-Soviet propaganda in this country, the outward and visible signs of which are to be seen both in articles and books. One of the worst examples of the latter is a book entitled "Is To-morrow Hitler's?" written by Mr. H. R. Knickerbocker in America over a year ago, when that country was neutral, and now published by Penguin Books Ltd. in this country, which is fighting Nazi Germany as an ally of the U.S.S.R., and has signed a treaty providing for intimate collaboration between our two countries for two decades after the war.

It is worth realising the circumstances under which this book is offered to the British public. In the last eighteen months, the great majority of people in Britain has become convinced that the Soviet peoples are fine folk. We do not only think that they are remarkably stubborn and courageous fighters; we are sure, too, that both their High Command and their officers and men, their supply services, and the industries on which they all rely, are very efficient. We have—most of us—also concluded that they are human, civilised, cultured, educated people, firmly united among themselves, and true to the bitter end to the anti-Nazi alliance. We also think of them, I fancy, as fighting for noble motives and ideals, holding life dear and human beings "the most valuable capital." We know that they have built up their country from the awful backwardness of Tsarist times by the enthusiastic co-operation of free men and women to a fairly high standard of living. And, above all, we have no doubt that they are in every respect poles asunder from the brutal, savage and immoral Nazis.

In the process of our eighteen months' study, we have arrived at a great and ever growing affection for our Soviet allies, an affection which has alarmed small but powerful reactionary sections of the British people, and led to the wave of anti-Soviet propaganda which I mentioned above.

And it is in just these circumstances that a firm of publishers which might have been expected to know better has published this second-hand Knickerbocker. Let us see what it says. It deals in separate chapters with Germany, "Russia," "England," France, and the U.S.A. Only the chapter on "Russia" is of any great importance, and, if it were not for that, there would be little need to comment; the book would then be no more and no less than the easy and rather superficial journalism of a writer who might be excused as naively unpolitical.

In the German chapter, he describes the Nazis as "a radical party," thinks the whole Nazi movement is "the accomplishment of one man, Adolf Hitler," and appears never to have heard of the fact that Hitler was financed and used by the industrial bosses; indeed, in another part of the book, he tells us that "the Nazis succeeded in coercing the capitalists into becoming useful members of the National Socialist coalition." He thinks Hitler is a really great man, but of course very evil. The only really bad features of this section are two. The first is a repetition of the old lie that Nazism and Communism are species of the same genus, "collectivism." (In fact, he throws Social Democracy into the same genus, for a change). The second, brought into the German section incidentally, is a description of Trotsky's alleged marvellous success as an orator in the U.S.S.R., with a story of the mounted police having to be brought out to move on the crowds that jammed the streets trying to get into the hall to hear him, on the last occasion on which he was "allowed to speak in the Soviet Union"; this Trotskyism is a tiny foretaste of the line he is to take in the Soviet chapter.

The chapters on "England," France and the U.S.A. are on much the same lines as that on Germany. There is the common rigmarole of libels on the French Communists; a friendly reference to Jan Valtin, author of the foul libel on the U.S.S.R., "Out of the Night," whose recent arrest under the deportation laws of the U.S.A. brought interesting revelations of his past (and present) activities as a German agent; a short description of the despicable Laval as "much like Stalin, an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Asiatic"; a quiet assumption that Hitler will "get the airplane factories of Russia"; a story that 4,000,000 people sleep in the air-raid shelters of London; and a consideration of the possibility of a negotiated peace between Britain and Germany.

These, the least harmful portions of the book, may seem undesirable enough; but when it comes to the section dealing with the U.S.S.R. one can only recommend that it be read with a basin at one's elbow.

Mr. Knickerbocker can give you an unflattering explanation of every Soviet achievement. For the resistance to Hitler's tremendous military power, which he is good enough to recognise as a fact, he gives four reasons. The first, that the Soviet peoples have "lives to waste and miles to waste"; that they live "almost like animals," on black bread and cabbage; that their High Command, knowing that they can afford to lose two to one and still have a large army left, has "wasted lives with abandon, but sometimes to advantage."

His second reason is that our Soviet allies are "untouched by the humanising influence of Christianity, immune to any form of pacifism, unsoftened by Western civilisation"; that they are the inventors of "totalitarian fanaticism," which the Nazis have only copied; that they are more savage than the Germans; and that —as "oriental Russians"—they surpass the "occidental" Germans in cruelty. Their greater savagery is due to their having been "hermetically sealed from the outside world" since 1918, and they are thus more fanatically homogeneous in their hatreds than the Nazis. (This, if you please, of a people who are in truth so humane that it took them a very long time, even in the face of the most appalling Nazi atrocities, to learn to hate the Nazis half enough).

They have, moreover, Knickerbocker tells you, undergone twenty-three years of unparalleled loss of life through revolution, famine, and terror, and they have not been "disillusioned" by a system which has given them a standard of living and culture beneath that of any large white community in the world. True, they preserve unity; but this is because all who differ from the ruling clique are "liquidated" the moment the difference is seen. "Soviet justice or Stalin policy" goes on the principle that it is better to execute a hundred innocents than to let one guilty escape; and the purge of 1934-38, which eliminated many valuable military and industrial leaders, "probably did," he is good enough to concede, "eliminate important Fifth Columnists."

This jumble of tawdry libels would seem to provide a number of convincing reasons why the epic defences of Leningrad, Moscow, Odessa, Sevastopol, and Stalingrad could not possibly have been maintained, to say nothing of the amazing skill and initiative displayed in the great offensives. But he has an explanation for this too; realising that it would be surprising that after such prolonged "starving and pain and suffering" they could still possess the morale to fight, he tells you that "faith thrives on tribulation." (This sounds a bit like Christian doctrine, by which, of course, they are untouched!)

Knickerbocker's third and fourth reasons are a little less scandalous. The third lies in the immense efforts and sacrifices which have been undertaken over many years to prepare for the burden of this war. This, too, he manages to decry and distort. The "régime," he says, imposed the greatest sacrifices upon the people for the sake of the armed forces; "though Russia starved, the Red Army ate well." Soviet economy was most backward, but such enormous sums were expended that they were bound to have effect. They produce few things of good quality, and attempt to make up in quantity for this lack of quality. (Their tanks, aeroplanes and artillery, I suppose!)

The fourth reason is the benefit derived from the occupation of the Finnish Mannerheim line and other western territories. In connection with this, he finds space to allege that Soviet guerillas "never took prisoners except to obtain information by torture."

He goes on to say that the strongest feelings animating "the Russians" are hatred of their enemies and fear of the consequences of defeat; but they also have a faith in themselves, due—if you please —to lack of knowledge of the outside world. Next, we learn that "the morality of the Nazis and the Bolsheviks is abhorrent"; and there follows a plain in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sinuation that the Bolsheviks are rather like the Moors who fought in the Spanish Civil War, whose abominable behaviour he describes in detail.

After a sneer about Stalin's gloomy face, which conveyed to Knickerbocker—profoundly inspired, we must assume, by the humanising influence of Christianity—that Stalin was worried by his apprehension that there might, after all, be a God, and a suggestion that the Bolsheviks are now encouraging and cashing in on the emotions of the "naturally religious Russian people," he at last finds it possible to say one kind word; we all owe, he tells us—without seeming likely to pay his debt—"profound gratitude and respect to the Russian people" for giving their lives to defeat the Germans, since every sacrifice of a Russian life means the possible saving of an American life. Their government is, of course, much worse than they deserve, but we must help them with supplies, even though these have to be sent "through their régime."

He has not nearly finished; he next discusses whether Hitler is likely to offer Stalin a compromise peace, and insinuates that Stalin would accept one. The general line of compromise would be "Stalin or some other Russian leader as his Gauleiter." Hitler would tell Stalin that he could utterly destroy Stalin and his system. Stalin would reply "Yes," but would point out that, with "several million employees of the Soviet bureaucracy," there could be such sabotage that Hitler would have to wait a long time before he got any supplies. Stalin might think that "by making a compromise peace he could save something, including his own job, from the wreck."

After more discussion of the possibility of a compromise peace, Knickerbocker goes on to ask himself "why Stalin ever fought at all." The answer is that he was given no choice; Hitler didn't offer terms, because he wanted a military victory! He didn't ask, e.g., for the demobilisation of the Red Army, because—Knickerbocker supposes—"he knew that even Stalin could not successfully order the demobilisation of the Red Army without suffering the danger of revolution. Stalin had acquiesced in every other German demand and encouraged the belief that he would not fight, but Hitler never made the trial." Knickerbocker "shares the opinion of many observers that Hitler could have had everything he liked from Stalin, beginning with the delivery of all available materials, even if it meant stripping the Russians, and including the permission to pass troops through Russia," (where to?) "and even including, perhaps, consent to as much of a demobilisation of the Red Army as Stalin believed he could order without danger of revolt."

After all this, apparently under the illusion that he has now "given quite a number of strong points of the Soviet Union," he turns to state its weak points. This, he tells us, he does "without pleasure." (The man must be a masochist!)

"It is no pleasure to expose the demerits of a force which for the time being, at any rate"—notice the sting in these three words—"is fighting against our major enemy, and has fought gallantly and suffered heavy losses;" but he faces bravely the unpleasant task. The fundamental weakness, the root of all the evil of the Soviet peoples, is that—unlike other people, I gather—they follow the rule that the end justifies the means. This thought starts him off on a new line of misrepresentation. They adopted "the Terror" to establish Socialism; this made Socialism impossible—they had not, it seems, the sense to see that, or the good fortune to have Knickerbocker there to tell them how to run their country—and thus "destroyed democracy." This made their "vaunted democracy" into a farce. Constant coercion of the masses through Terror numbed them (numbed them, I suppose, into their conduct in the present war). They became a "permanent pauper state." (I wonder on whom the paupers battened!) They were barbarians, better able than civilised folk to stand up "to their Nazi brother barbarians."

Moreover, the Bolsheviks used the Terror to force everybody into a national planned economy; but "national planned terror plus Bolshevik zeal have been less successful than capitalist economy."

The capitalist world is "as free as bird life" compared with the Soviet Union or with Nazi Germany. There is an absolute lack of freedom in the totalitarian world, whether Bolshevik or Nazi. The Soviet effort at planned economy broke down—

PRODUCED 2005 BY OCR.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you and I didn't know that it had—because it was, in effect, "penitentiary production" (*i.e.*, convict labour). Two per cent. were zealous Communists, and "terror was used to make" the other 98 per cent. "fit in and work."

After a good deal more allegation of such mismanagement as would have sufficed to bring the Soviet military machine to irreparable disaster in a month, he offers an explanation for "such inefficiency and wastefulness." This is "the historical fact" that twice in twenty years the Bolsheviks exterminated their ablest people—"or rather, I should say, the Bolsheviks first killed off the ablest people of old Russia and then Stalin killed off the ablest Bolsheviks." This they did from the belief that they could not establish Communism, or Socialism, without physically exterminating the persons who under capitalism had become better off than the mass of the people. So they exterminated the aristocracy and landowners, several hundred thousands in all; then the industrialists, then the managers, supervisors, technicians, scientists, dentists, surgeons, lawyers, teachers, and judges; "these number a million or more." Then, after a rest, they tackled the kulaks, "people who had become prosperous through individual industry and sagacity," "the more enterprising farm workers and their families." They exterminated them too; "on a conservative estimate, 5,000,000." This ought to have satisfied the Bolsheviks; "but it did not satisfy Stalin," for "then came the fatal quarrel between Stalin and Trotsky." (Actually, Trotsky's exit from the U.S.S.R., at the end of 1928, preceded the so-called purge of kulaks by more than a year). The result of this "quarrel," he tells us, was the great purges by Stalin "which destroyed for the second time within a generation the principal talent of Russia." Stalin killed off, you are asked to believe, "the top fourth or fifth of the party, of the army, navy and air force leaders, and then of the new Bolshevik intelligentsia," the foremost technicians, managers, supervisors and scientists.

He turns for a moment to say again that the Russians have fought well—"Russians have always fought under any régime bravely, enduringly, stubbornly, gallantly"—but, "if there had been the exceptional value in the Soviet collectivist system which is ascribed to it by its disciples in America, it should not merely have stopped, but should have defeated, routed and conquered the Germans." (This, if you please, in the first four or five months of the war.)

He then belittles even their preparation for war. Their (so inefficient) economy turns out, he complains, to have been a one-purpose economy, organised for nothing but fighting, and you must guard against measuring the value of a society by its war-making efficiency. (This is as good as saying: "You may die for us, you will do it rather well; but you are not fit to live with us"). If one took that measure, he says, we ought to value the Nazis, who "met their identical twin when they struck the Red Army in battle."

He concludes the chapter with a discussion as to whether the U.S.A. can give sufficient supplies to the U.S.S.R. After saying that they can't get enough supplies through to make any real difference before the spring of 1942 (he was writing, of course, a year or more ago) he adds: "But everything is up to Stalin. If he wishes to quit, and announce that he had not received sufficient aid from Britain and the United States, he will be able to do so at any time during the next several months, and make a case at least among his friends."

In all that long chapter, there are not ten lines of approval of the Soviet Union, nor a word of unqualified recognition of any of the magnificent things it has achieved, or of the immense problems it has solved.

The circumstances in which this nauseating material reaches the British public at this stage have already been mentioned. It is not for me to judge what American stomachs can digest in a period of neutrality, and the book had, at any rate, the merit that it contained some arguments in favour of America entering the war. But it is now being published in Britain, a year later, when everything that has happened since it was published makes the untruth of its grotesque and almost obscene misrepresentation of the Soviet peoples even more obvious than it was at first.

Why does this happen? I don't know. In the name of Trotsky and Darlan, I don't know. If I wrote five columns, I couldn't tell you why—for certain. But I

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can tell you how it is published, and how it may get distributed. It is published, as already mentioned, by Penguin Books Ltd. It presumably passed the Editorial Board of that concern, including Mr. W. E. Williams. Mr. W. E. Williams is the head of the "Army Bureau of Current Affairs," and is connected with the Army Education Department. He has, I take it, a great deal of influence as to what is told to the troops in their educational hours, and as to what they read; (and what information is given to the troops who are engaged in a war on the same side as the Soviet peoples, and want to know what their allies are like, is of tremendous importance.) One may guess that Mr. Williams is not likely to discourage the circulation among the troops of a book he has co-operated in passing for Penguins. Indeed, the book has already found its way on to the "Forces Book List," and is thus distributed to every unit subscribing to that list. Could there be a worse service to morale?

The publishers add, I notice, on the title page, a little plea that you should "leave this book at a Post Office when you have read it, so that men and women in the Services may enjoy it too." (Enjoy, my God!)

I can't think at the moment of any slander on the Soviet Union that Mr. Knickerbocker has forgotten to repeat; but if any Trotskyite or Imperial Policy Grouper can think one up, he can always ask Knickerbocker to write another book and put it in, and ask Messrs. Penguins whether they will use precious paper and print to put it out, and Mr. Williams whether the Forces would like to see it.

It is interesting to observe the effect of the book on other minds. Professor Laski, for example, writing in the *New Statesman and Nation*, thinks that on Russia Mr. Knickerbocker's view, "deals with the problem"—what *problem*?—"by standards that are largely inapplicable," and then goes on to say that he "cannot imagine a more useful book than this for use among the armed forces."

Perhaps the B.B.C. would praise the book too. Did they know about it when they put Mr. Knickerbocker "on the air" a few weeks ago, to tell us that our democracies could learn something from the Nazi "collectivist" system?

We, and our Soviet allies whom Knickerbocker maligns, will see that "To-morrow" is not Hitler's; but is it not about time that people who write and publish stuff of this sort should belong to Yesterday?

I think that the reader who has read this description of Knickerbocker's views of our Soviet allies deserves to be reminded of just one of the countless heroic incidents of the war, to take the nasty taste away. I remember, the last time I was in the Soviet Union, travelling with a large number of Red Navy men, belonging to the Black Sea Fleet. They were fine, sturdy youngsters, with delightful manners, proud and determined, with a great love of life. I wondered how long they would live. I know now how some of them lived. *The Times*, in one of its best despatches of the war, has told me. They went ashore and donned Red Army uniform, to fight for Sebastopol. The situation there grew worse and worse, and finally their commander called them together on the Malakhov Kurgan, and addressed them. Let *The Times* tell you what he said, and what they did. He said:—

> Twenty-five years ago Lenin ordered our ships to be sunk at Novorossisk—these orders were obeyed. Last year Stalin ordered us to blow up the Dnieper Dam, and we did. Now we have to die. We have to die for those who, one day, will return to Sebastopol; we have to die for those who will one day build another Dnieper Dam. We have to die for those who will go on fighting at sea."

And the men—these fine youngsters whom Knickerbocker libels :—

> The men removed their caps and stood silent for a short time and then swore an oath to conquer or die. They returned to their guns wearing under their Red Army blouses their striped sailor jerseys "for luck," and twisted round their forage caps hat-bands bearing the names of their ships. A few days later they were surrounded, and thousands of bombs fell on the Malakhov Kurgan; they fought till the last shell had been fired and then blew up themselves and their guns. No white flag ever flew at Sevastopol!

We most of us think that the white flag is the only bit of military equipment the Soviet fighters haven't got. What colour is Knickerbocker's flag?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

Nazi Atrocities: their motive and penalty

Soviet Documents on Nazi Atrocities (Hutchinson, 5s).

THIS BOOK is an indispensable weapon of war. A *must* for every citizen, schoolroom and public library. It must be passed from hand to hand in every factory.

To this day, there are millions of people in this country who have no idea what Fascism really is. They can hardly believe the incredible horror of it.

One of the reasons is that there flourishes a scepticism about atrocities. A basically unhealthy and morbid turning away from reality, this is none the less founded on two reasonable reservations. One is the recollection of how many of the "atrocity stories" of the war of 1914-18 proved to have been deliberate concoctions faked up in propaganda offices. The other is the realisation that war is characteristically brutal—frightened men living on the edge of death are apt to lose restraint and murder out of fear.

This form of liberalism, so prejudiced that it chooses to close its ivory eyelids to the facts, is a danger to civilisation. After all, despite the fact the shepherd's early warnings had been bogus, there was a wolf there in the end and scepticism helped it to destroy the flock.

The facts are such that the man who seeks to whistle them away is acting as accomplice to the wolf. Something appalling stalks the world and this book will help all readers to realise its nature. Documents, photographs, may not be proof. They accurately describe the features of the monster. The proof lies in experience itself, no further distant from our sheltered island than across the Channel.

We must remember that these horrors are not a thing of war only. Fascism committed on its own people equal abominations in times of peace. We must remember that in all human history there is no precedent. Ths is not a matter of men out of control. The restraint displayed by German forces in their handlings of peoples they still expect to control by appeasement is a sufficient proof. The novelty of the phenomenon is indicated by the contrast between the frightened British troops running amok in Dublin homesteads and shooting Sheehy-Skeffington and the eagerness of the authorities to find excuses, even to the point of pleading insanity, for the execution—with the Nazi *glorification* of all their crimes.

It is this glorification, the philosophical basis for the bestiality, that expresses itself on the practical plane in such ghastly human suffering and degradation. The lesson inculcated into Nazi youth is the justice of conquest, the deserts of strength, the crime of weakness, the sin of pity.

The race theory destroys sympathies and includes every sex and age among the victims. Passivity—as in the Jews—exempts as little as resistance, as in the Soviet people. The conscience that the act is vile is stilled by the teaching that its vileness proves it virtue.

There is nothing to do with this wolf but to destroy it. And the destruction presents a problem that is not merely military, but comprised in the human beings perverted by this wolf-idea. It is here that arises the question of punishment. This is necessary, not in the pseudo-religious sense of retribution, but in the quite simple penological sense of a tactical preventive measure, to root out and deter by example.

The policy of the non-Soviet Allies on this question is the most complete of their mistakes. On the one hand, pretexts for varying degrees of honour and hospitality to such as Hess, Thoma, Crawell and Berganzoli. On the other, Vansittart propaganda and chain practice of reprisal irrespective of individual guilt. It would be difficult to devise a course more calculated to reassure the fears of the big monster, opening to him a hope of escape of consequences and drive to despair the small monster, holding out to him a prospect of penalty irrespective of whether he obeys or disobeys the criminal orders he receives. It is so irrational as a tactic that it is clear its motive must be found in the political objective of appeasement rather than in the penological field.

The Soviet plan of trial and punishment of the offender here and now, as soon as—with sufficient evidence—he falls into Allied hands, is calculated, by its proof of determination to punish, to alarm the big criminal with the inevitability of his doom and encourage all who would revolt against him with the assurance that he would not be left free to exact revenge upon them later.

The fact that some voice, in opposition to this proposal, the fear that such punishment will increase Nazi violence, betrays how deeply this book is needed. Is the fascist then, nasty only in response to being hurt? Is it anger on his part and not policy, that decides his crimes? To such a Himalayan error this book will prove a full corrective.

IVOR MONTAGU.

Indispensable Guide to India

Guide to the Problem of India by R. Palme Dutt (V. Gollancz, 200 pp., 4s6d).

A FEW weeks ago a prominent British statesman explained that the Government's policy in regard to colonies is to assist their development until such time as they are able to govern themselves, and of course that statement was hailed with acclamation by the assembled peers. It was old Voltaire who wrote that "speech was given to man to disguise his thoughts"; and this is a classic example. As a matter of fact, there is not now and never has been any intention of any British Cabinet to apply the principle of self-determination to any colony. The Prime Minister has made that clear in his interpretation of the Atlantic Charter, although the other first signatory to that document has stated

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Charter applies to all nations. The motto is "what we have we hold," particularly in regard to India.

For close on a century India has been governed by Britain and for a century and a half before that the East India Company exploited the Indian people to the last ounce. In fact, the primary reason for the British Government taking over full control was to ensure that the loot should pass into their hands.

Despite the fact that India is a sub-continent of Asia with a population of 375 millions, little is known by the man in the street of the conditions of life of the people. Very few people here would credit the statement that men on the tea plantations receive 4½d. to 7d. a day, that miners are paid the munificent sum of 9d. a day and that the average wage for the working people of India is under 3d. a day. For the bulk of the people housing conditions beggar description. Shacks without windows or chimneys, a common water tap and no sanitation. A terribly high mortality rate, particularly among children, prevails throughout the country, and the average length of life is only half that of the western countries.

The general poverty existing is almost indescribable, and yet India is a country rich with natural resources, sufficient to maintain most of the so-called key industries. Long before England became industrialised India was famous for its iron and steel products and although steel is manufactured there now, it is on a strictly limited scale. The main industries are textile and agriculture, and the writer mostly remembers the cotton mills in a Lancashire town being stripped of machinery for export to India, because of cheap Indian labour.

But if the people are exploited to the utmost degree, the "brightest jewel in the crown" yields a rich harvest to her rulers. £150 millions a year is drained away to Britain and that is the real reason why Britain retains her hold on the country.

The disease is desperate and the only way out is independence for India. The ruling class argue that before that stage can be reached there must be agreement between the various bodies or sects. Moslem and Hindu must agree on a common policy, say the pundits—and at the same time the Government uses every artifice to prevent agreement. Then there is the position of the Indian States and the Untouchables. Again, there is the problem of illiteracy, where after a century of British rule only one in ten of the population can read or write. But the problem is not insoluble. Those who have read the history of Russia will see some resemblance to the conditions existing in India and will realise that the only way out will be to follow the Soviet method. The Soviet revolution had a profound effect on the Indian people and explains why the Congress Party represents the masses of the people. Therefore, it is appropriate that, coinciding with the anniversary of the Soviet Revolution, this new book by R. Palme Dutt on India should make its appearance.

The book is a complete historical record of British occupation and effects. It explains in simple language all the knotty points of the problem. To all who desire to be fully informed on the subject I recommend them to place an order for it forthwith. No student of politics can afford to be without it. The reader will find the book does not merely express the writer's opinions, but quotes effectively the statements and writings of recognised authorities on the subject. You will find the reasons for the breakdown of the Cripps negotiations fully explained, and in the light of Churchill's statement of September 10, 1942, you will agree with me that the proposals were not seriously put forward to effect a settlement. You will also realise that if this great sub-continent is to be kept in chains there is no possibility of world freedom.

The book is particularly suitable for Discussion Groups. Every factory and workshop should purchase its quota and it should be on the shelves of every public library. Its price is 4*s.* 6*d.* net; but the contents are invaluable.

P. G. BARSTOW, M.P.

BOUND VOLUMES 1942

Bound Volumes for 1942 have been put in hand. Many readers were unable to secure Bound Volumes for 1941 through not applying in time. Only a strictly limited number of copies will be available. Prices are as follows :—

Bound Volume, 1942, in handsome dark blue binding, with gold lettering ... ... 11s. 0d.

Bound Volume, 1942, in Part Exchange for at least 10 loose copies... ... ... 7s. 6d.

The above prices include postage.

We must ask readers to let us have their orders, remittances and loose copies (in good condition, fit for binding) immediately. Please pack very carefully. Orders will be treated in strict priority.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GROUPS

ARE YOU PREPARED to meet the decisive struggles which will face the British people in the year 1943?

ARE YOU EQUIPPED to face the swift changes and unexpected developments which will take place?

The answer to these questions can be found in LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Groups through open friendly discussion, which will give you a basis for clearer understanding of world events.

Do not stand bewildered and unprepared. Join your local Discussion Group now. Write to the Discussion Groups Department; we will be glad to send you all the particulars you require.

The following few extracts from Discussion Group reports will give you some idea of the knowledge and enjoyment gained through a LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Group.

"Again the urgency of the need to open the Second Front stressed; this linked with the need to reopen negotiations with India. . . . Weakness of the Labour Movement and its potential strength. The logical conclusion to work harder than ever before in Trade Unions, Joint Production Committees, Co-op Guilds, etc. . . . The discussion was very good—everyone had something to say. Reasons for Soviet Union's call for Hess trial explained."

—Clifton D.G.

"The opener outlined the achievements of the U.S.S.R. in the last twenty-five years and suggested that it is necessary again to remind English people what Fascism stands for. Discussion centred chiefly on this point and to a lesser extent on Darlan's significance in the present situation."

—Crowthorne D.G.

"Discussion opened by woman member based completely on the notes with particular reference to India. Debate centred on India, but veered back to Second Front with last war officer (local Conservative) in surprisingly outspoken support."

——Burgh Heath D.G.

"Discussion centred rather on the advantage to Hitler of immobilising our Second Front movement. One member found it difficult to see how this was a political issue and the point was thrashed out at some length and our member convinced."

—Northallerton D.G.

"The LABOUR MONTHLY makes our theory *live* and the Guide makes us *jump to it*. 'Theory without practice is sterile; practice without theory is blind,' says the world's greatest living Marxist. Then we know that the LABOUR MONTHLY must be carrying forward the banner of Marxism."

—Subscriber to Discussion Guide.

DISCUSSION GROUPS DEPARTMENT, 134 Ballards Lane, Finchley, London, N.3

(Please send STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE for particulars together with 2d. for sample GUIDE or 2/- for a year's subscription).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN'S
COLLECTED WORKS
Volume XIX

This volume, the sixth to be published in England out of a series of thirty, contains the writings covering the year 1916 and early 1917. It includes the famous work IMPERIALISM in a slightly amended translation.

Articles dealing with the major European countries, the National Question, problems of the working-class movement and many other important questions contribute to a fuller understanding of that eventful period in world history.

12/6 net

LAWRENCE & WISHART, LIMITED

2, Southampton Place · London · W.C.1

HITLER'S "NEW ORDER" IN EUROPE

A Symposium

organised by

The Faculties of Science and Political Economy of Marx House

at the

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE

(near Holborn Tube Station)

on Saturday and Sunday, January 30th and 31st, 1943.

I. The Organisation of Europe under Nazism for the conquest of the World.

II. The methods of enslavement—ideological and political—and the movement of resistance.

III. The United Nations and the Liberation Movement.

Admission 3/6 to all 3 sessions; 1/6 to any single session. Applications for tickets and further particulars to:—

FACULTY OF SCIENCE,
MARX HOUSE,
1, DOUGHTY STREET, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED